DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 474 866 TM 034 804

AUTHOR	Dunn, Karyn; Strafford, Ed; Marston, Chris
TITLE	Classroom Assessment Practices in English and Mathematics at Years 5, 7, and 9.
INSTITUTION	New Zealand Council for Educational Research, Wellington.
ISBN	ISBN-1-877293-21-0
PUB DATE	2003-00-00
NOTE	148p.
AVAILABLE FROM	NZCER Distribution Services, P.O. Box 3237, Wellington, NZ. Web site: http://www.nzcer.org.nz.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS
DESCRIPTORS	Elementary School Students; *Elementary School Teachers; Foreign Countries; Intermediate Grades; Middle School Students; Middle Schools
IDENTIFIERS	*New Zealand

ABSTRACT

This study investigated current classroom assessment practices by surveying teachers in New Zealand at years 5, 7, and 9 on the assessments they use in the areas of English and mathematics, the purposes of the assessment, and the assessments that provide the most useful information. A total of 676 questionnaires were returned from 311 full primary, contributing, intermediate, composite, and secondary schools (response rate of 65%). More than half the respondents (69%) were female, and 56% had been teaching more than 10 years. In both English and mathematics the use of teacher or school developed tools and strategies was greater than the use of externally developed tools. The only externally developed tools to have high rates of use across all years were the Progressive Achievement Tests and Competition tests. In both English and mathematics, teachers in decile 1-3 schools used Competition tests significantly less. In both subject areas, assessment was used most frequently for purposes within the classroom. Less use of assessment was made for purposes outside the classroom, but when it was used, it came more often from externally developed tools. The greatest number of tools and strategies that were rated as "useful" or "very useful" by more than 50% were for teaching and learning and monitoring progress. Teachers also indicated that they received useful feedback about assessment results from a range of sources, including students, parents, other teachers, and administrators. Teacher reported that they consulted widely on issues of assessment, with 51% reporting that they used at least one type of external professional development. Most teacher reported that there was a difference in the amount of assessment they did in the two subject areas, and most reported that they did more assessment than they did 3 years ago. Only about half reported the amount as being about right, however. Six appendixes contain questionnaire responses and materials used in the study. (Contains 66 tables and 37 references.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 474 866

Classroom Assessment Practices in English and Mathematics at Years 5, 7, and 9

Karyn Dunn, Ed Strafford, and Chris Marston

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE,
AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC
COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY,
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. Webber

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

NEW ZEALAND COUNCIL FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
TE RUNANGA O AOTEAROA MO TE RANGAHAU I TE MATAURANGA

TM034804

CLASSROOM ASSESSMENT PRACTICES IN ENGLISH AND MATHEMATICS AT YEARS 5, 7, AND 9

Karyn Dunn, Ed Strafford, and Chris Marston

New Zealand Council for Educational Research
Te Rūnanga o Aotearoa mō te Rangahau i te Mātauranga
Wellington
2003

New Zealand Council for Educational Research
PO Box 3237
Wellington
New Zealand

© NZCER, 2003

ISBN 1-877293-21-0

Distributed by NZCER Distribution Services
PO Box 3237
Wellington
New Zealand
www.nzcer.org.nz

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to give our thanks to all those involved in this project. Lia Mapa for her work on all phases of the project and specifically, the data analysis, Barb Bishop for the data management and early analyses, Carlene Grigg for her assistance with the word-processing through out this project, and the NZCER library staff for providing assistance with the literature review and on-going identification of relevant literature.

We would also like to acknowledge the invaluable contributions made by our project sponsor, Cedric Croft, and critical colleague, Sally Boyd.

We were fortunate enough to have the support and guidance of an expert advisory committee for which we are indebted. They were: Michael Absolum, Evaluation Associates; Mary Chamberlain, Ministry of Education; Helen Chong, PPTA representative; Lester Flockton, Educational Assessment Research Unit, University of Otago; Virginia Francis, NZEI representative; Linda Gendall, Wellington College of Education; and Geoff Moore, Curriculum Advice and Support, Christchurch College of Education.

Finally, without the teachers who found the time within their already busy schedules to complete the questionnaire, this research would not have been possible. To them, we are truly grateful.

CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS iii

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY xi

1 INTRODUCTION 1
  Objectives of the Questionnaire 1
  The Research Context 1
    The Formative-Summative Debate 2
    Teacher Practice in Relation to the "Formative Ideal" 2
    Ministry of Education Assessment Initiatives 3
  Literature Review 3
    Types of Assessment Tools and Strategies Used 3
    Teachers' Use of Assessment Information 6
    The Flow of Assessment Information 7
    Usefulness of Assessment Information 7
    Attitudes Towards Assessment 7
    Amount of Assessment 8

2 METHODOGY 9
  Sampling and Procedure 9
  Questionnaire Design 9
  Response Rates 10
  Characteristics of the Schools 11
  Characteristics of the Teachers 11
  Summary of the Teachers Who Responded 15

3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION 17
  Use and Usefulness of the English Tools and Strategies 17
    English Assessment Tools and Strategies Used in the Classroom 17
      Significant Differences in the Uses of the Tools by Year Level 19
      Significant Differences in the Uses of the Tools by Decile 19
      Significant Differences in the Uses of the Tools by Intermediate and Full Primary Schools 19
      Significant Differences in the Uses of the Tools by Management Level 19
      Significant Differences in the Uses of the Tools by Length of Teaching 19
      Significant Differences in the Uses of the Tools by Area 19
    Frequency of Use of the English Tools Used 21
    Information Recorded by Teachers 23
    Use of the English Assessment Information 24
      Teaching and Learning and Monitoring Progress 25
      Students and Parents or Caregivers 26

Page

    - Next Year's Teacher and School Management 28
    - External Agencies 29
    - Summary of Uses 29
  - Usefulness of the English Assessment Information 29
    - Teaching and Learning and Monitoring Progress 30
    - Students and Parents or Caregivers 32
    - Next Year's Teacher, School Management and External Agencies 33
    - Significant Differences in the Usefulness of the Tools 35
    - Summary of Usefulness 35
  - Summary of English Tools and Strategies 36
- Use and Usefulness of the Mathematics Tools and Strategies 38
  - Mathematics Assessment Tools and Strategies Used in the Classroom 38
    - Significant Differences in the Uses of the Tools by Year Level 39
    - Significant Differences in the Uses of the Tools by Decile 39
    - Significant Differences in the Uses of the Tools by Intermediate and Full Primary Schools 39
    - Significant Differences in the Uses of the Tools by Management Level 39
    - Significant Differences in the Uses of the Tools by Length of Teaching 40
    - Significant Differences in the Uses of the Tools by Area 40
  - Frequency of Use of the Mathematics Tools Used 41
  - Information Recorded by Teachers 42
  - Teachers' Use of the Mathematics Assessment Information 44
    - Teaching and Learning and Monitoring Progress 44
    - Students and Parents or Caregivers 45
    - Next Year's Teacher and School Management 46
    - External Agencies 47
    - Summary of Uses 48
  - Usefulness of the Mathematics Assessment Information Gained 48
    - Teaching and Learning and Monitoring Progress 49
    - Students and Parents or Caregivers 50
    - Next Year's Teacher, School Management, and External Agencies 51
    - Significant Differences in the Usefulness of the Assessment Tools 53
    - Summary of Usefulness 53
  - Summary of Mathematics Tools and Strategies 54
- Comparison of English and Mathematics Tool Use and Usefulness 55
- Broader Classroom Assessment Issues 56
  - Assessments Required Which Teachers Would Not Choose to do 56
  - Most and Least Frequently Assessed English Functions 57
  - Most and Least Frequently Assessed Mathematics Strands 59
  - Most and Least Frequently Assessed Curriculum Areas 61
  - Changes In, and Satisfaction With, Assessment 64
  - Sources of Feedback and Information 65
  - Inconsistencies Between School Policy and Classroom Practice 67

Page

Desired New Tools 68
General Comments 69

4 CONCLUSIONS 71
1. What assessments are being used in the areas of English and mathematics at Years 5, 7, and 9? 71
2. Why are the assessments undertaken? 73
3. Which assessments are the most useful? 74
Teacher Practice in Relation to the "Formative Ideal" 76

5 REFERENCES 77

APPENDICES

A. Complete English data for those responses that were summarised in the results section 81
B. Complete mathematics data for where responses were summarised in the results section 107
C. Letter sent to schools with the questionnaire requesting participation 131
D. Instructions sent for the random selection of the teacher(s) 133
E. Follow-up fax sent to schools 135
F. Questionnaire 137

TABLES

1. Schools Sampled and Questionnaires Sent by Year Level 9
2. Response Rate of the Schools Sampled 10
3. Comparison of National, Sample, and Return Data by School Decile 11
4. Comparison of National, Sample, and Return Data by Area 11
5. Number of Teachers Who Responded 12
6. Comparison of National, Sample, and Return Data by School Size 12
7. Gender of Teachers Responding 13
8. Years Teaching 13
9. Teacher's Position of Responsibility Within School 13
10. Teachers With Curriculum Responsibilities 14
11. Curriculum Responsibilities Identified 14
12. Teachers' Use of English Assessment Tools and Strategies 18
13. Most Frequently Chosen Category for Frequency of Use 22
14. Most Frequently Chosen Category for Information Recorded 24
15. Tools Used by 50 percent or More of Teachers for Providing Information for Teaching and Learning 25
16. Tools Used by 50 percent or More of Teachers for Providing Information for Monitoring Progress 25

Page

17. Tools Used by 50 percent or More of Teachers for Providing Information for Students 26
18. Tools Used by 50 percent or More of Teachers for Providing Information for Parents or Caregivers 27
19. Tools Used by 50 percent or More of Teachers for Providing Information for Next Year's Teachers 28
20. Tools Used by 50 percent or More of Teachers for Providing Information for School Management 28
21. Rank Order of the Usefulness of the Useful Tools for Providing Information for Teaching and Learning 30
22. Rank Order of the Usefulness of the Useful Tools for Providing Information for Monitoring Progress 31
23. Rank Order of the Usefulness of the Useful Tools for Providing Information for Students 32
24. Rank Order of the Usefulness of the Useful Tools for Providing Information for Parents or Caregivers 32
25. Rank Order of the Usefulness of the Useful Tools for Providing Information for Next Year's Teacher 33
26. Rank Order of the Usefulness of the Useful Tools for Providing Information for School Management 34
27. Rank Order of the Usefulness of the Tools for Providing Information for External Agencies 34
28. Teachers' Use of Mathematics Assessment Tools and Strategies 38
29. Most Frequently Chosen Category for Frequency of Use 41
30. Most Frequently Chosen Category for Information Recorded 43
31. Tools Used by 50 percent or More of Teachers for Providing Information for Teaching and Learning 44
32. Tools Used by 50 percent or More of Teachers for Providing Information for Monitoring Progress 44
33. Tools Used by 50 percent or More of Teachers for Providing Information for Students 45
34. Tools Used by 50 percent or More of Teachers for Providing Information for Parents or Caregivers 46
35. Tools Used by 50 percent or More of Teachers for Providing Information for Next Year's Teachers 46
36. Tools Used by 50 percent or More of Teachers for Providing Information for School Management 47
37. Tools Used by 50 percent or More of Teachers for Providing Information for External Agencies 47
38. Rank Order of the Usefulness of the Useful Tools for Providing Information for Teaching and Learning 49
39. Rank Order of the Usefulness of the Useful Tools for Providing Information for Monitoring Progress 49

Page

40. Rank Order of the Usefulness of the Useful Tools for Providing Information for Studentds 50
41. Rank Order of the Usefulness of the Useful Tools for Providing Information for Parents or Caregivers 50
42. Rank Order of the Usefulness of the Useful Tools for Providing Information for Next Year's Teacher 51
43. Rank Order of the Usefulness of the Useful Tools for Providing Information for School Management 52
44. Rank Order of the Usefulness of the Useful Tools for Providing Information for External Agencies 52
45. Teachers Who Indicated they Would Not Use a Particular English Tool if Given the Choice 56
46. Teachers Who Indicated they Would Not Use a Particular Mathematics Tool if Given the Choice 56
47. Which English Function is the Most Frequently Assessed? 57
48. Main Reasons for a Function Being the Most Frequently Assessed 58
49. Teachers Indicating Which Function is the Least Frequently Assessed? 58
50. Teachers' Main Reason(s) for a Function Being the Least Frequently Assessed 59
51. Which Mathematics Strand is the Most Frequently Assessed? 59
52. Teachers' Main Reasons for a Strand Being the Most Frequently Assessed 60
53. Which Strand is the Least Frequently Assessed? 60
54. Teachers' Main Reason(s) for a Strand Being the Least Frequently Assessed 61
55. Teachers' Identification of the Most Frequently Assessed Curriculum Area 62
56. Reasons Given for Assessing the Curriculum Area Identified the Most Frequently 62
57. Teachers' Identification of the Least Frequently Assessed Curriculum Area 63
58. Reasons Given for Assessing the Identified Curriculum Area the Least Frequently 63
59. Teachers' Mean Rating of How Much Assessment is Done Now, Compared With 3 years Ago 64
60. Teachers' Mean Rating of the Amount of Assessment They Are Doing Now 65
61. People Who Give Teachers Feedback About Their Students' Assessment Results 65
62. How Useful Teachers Found the Feedback to be 66
63. Teachers' Sources of Assessment Information 66
64. Teachers Reporting an Inconsistency Between School Policy and Classroom Practice 67
65. Teachers' Reasons for the Inconsistency Between Policy and Practice 68
66. Tools Identified to be Developed 68

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study investigated current classroom assessment practices by surveying teachers at Years 5, 7, and 9 on what assessments they use in the areas of English and mathematics, the purposes of the assessment, and which assessments provide the most useful information.

A total of 676 questionnaires from 311 schools (response rate of 65%) were received from a stratified random sample of schools. Full primary, contributing, intermediate, composite, and secondary schools were all included in the sample, as were state, state integrated, and private schools.

Of the teachers who responded to the survey, 69 percent were female and 31 percent were male. Fifty six percent had been teaching for more than 10 years and 42 percent held either a middle or senior management position. Thirty five percent had curriculum responsibilities, the majority being responsible for a year group, sub-curriculum area, curriculum leadership, or Head of Department.

Overall in both English and mathematics, use of teacher or school developed tools and strategies was greater than that of externally developed tools. The only externally developed tools to have consistently high levels of use across all years were the Progressive Achievement Tests and Competition tests. However, in both English and mathematics, teachers in decile 1–3 schools used Competition tests significantly less.

For both English and mathematics, assessment was used most frequently for purposes within the classroom. For these classroom purposes, a mix of teacher or school and externally developed tools and strategies were used in English. In mathematics, more teacher or school developed tools and strategies were used. Less use was made of assessment information for purposes outside the classroom, but when it was used, it came more often from externally developed tools.

The greatest number of tools and strategies that were rated as being "useful" or "very useful" by more than 50 percent, were for teaching and learning and monitoring progress. Fewer tools and strategies, but still the majority, were rated as being "useful" for providing information to students and parents or caregivers, but fewer still for next year's teacher, school management, and external agencies.

Teacher or school developed tools and strategies were the most highly rated in both English and mathematics for providing information for teaching and learning, monitoring progress, students, and parents or caregivers. Externally developed, more formal methods of assessment, became more prominent for providing information for next year's teacher, school management, and external agencies.

Although in English the ratings of the most useful tools and strategies did not fluctuate greatly across the different purposes, this was not so in mathematics. There was a much more pronounced decrease in the mean rating of usefulness as the recipient of the information became more distant from the classroom.

Other findings included teachers indicating that they receive useful feedback about assessment results from a range of sources including students, parents, other teachers, and senior and middle management. The Board of Trustees was one source where little feedback was received, and what was received, was of limited use.

Teachers also reported that they consult widely on issues of assessment, with 51 percent indicating that they utilised at least one type of external professional development initiative, that is Advisors, Assessment for Better Learning Facilitators, or short courses, seminars, or workshops.

Teachers were asked if there was a difference in the amount of assessment they do for the different functions in English. Eighty seven percent of Year 5, 79 percent of Year 7, and 79 percent of Year 9 teachers indicated that there was. Year 5 and 7 teachers appeared to be relatively equally divided between reading and writing as being the most frequently assessed English function whereas at Year 9, writing was the most frequently assessed. At Years 5 and 7 the least assessed function was viewing and at Year 9 it was listening.

Seventy seven percent Year 5, 56 percent Year 7, and 36 percent Year 9 teachers indicated that there was a difference in the amount of assessment they do for the different mathematics strands. Number was identified almost exclusively as the most frequently assessed strand by Years 5 and 7 teachers.

Eighty two percent Year 5 and 72 percent Year 7 teachers responded that there was a difference in the amount of assessment they do for the different curriculum areas. Both English and mathematics were identified as being the most assessed curriculum area and the arts was identified by over half the teachers as being the least frequently assessed curriculum area.

Although the majority of teachers reported that they were doing more assessment in English and mathematics than they were three years ago, just over half perceived this amount as being about right.

The second phase of this study is documenting the assessment practices of 9 schools that have been identified as having good assessment practices. This will help give a better understanding of how some of the findings described in this report in fact influence the practices of the classroom teacher.

1 INTRODUCTION

This report provides results from the first phase of a two-year study on current classroom assessment practices in New Zealand schools. The aim of the first phase was to document assessment practices at Years 5, 7, and 9 in the curriculum areas of English and mathematics through the use of a questionnaire. The second phase will expand on this information by conducting case studies of 9 schools with "good assessment practice". The project is being undertaken as part of the New Zealand Council for Educational Research's purchase agreement with the Ministry of Education.

Given the current educational environment and some of the recent government initiatives in assessment, it seemed timely to collect base-line data which can be used to track changes in classroom assessment practices.

Objectives of the Questionnaire

The research proposal outlined three research questions with a number of specific foci. As the project progressed, the questions were further refined with some elements being selected for inclusion in the questionnaire, and others being left to the case study phase. The final research questions for the questionnaire phase of the study were:

1. What assessments are being used in the areas of English and mathematics at Years 5, 7, and 9?

   The research comments on issues such as what assessments are actually being used in classrooms, frequency of use, how much assessment is externally developed, as opposed to teacher or school developed, and what information is recorded.

2. Why are the assessments undertaken?

   Here the research examines the purpose for which each assessment is used, whether any feedback is received about the assessment results, and if there are any required assessments that would not be used if the teacher was given the choice.

3. Which assessments are the most useful?

   The research investigates how useful each assessment is seen to be for a variety of purposes, and where the perceived gaps in assessment are.

The Research Context

In order to provide a background for the current study, three areas that are likely to influence the nature of teacher practices, and consequently the structure of this research will be outlined: the formative-summative debate, teacher practice in relation to the "formative ideal", and the Ministry of Education's assessment initiatives. These areas are not discrete. As well as illuminating and influencing classroom practice, they illuminate and influence each other.

The Formative-Summative Debate

The work of Carr, McGee, Jones, McKinley, Bell, Barr, and Simpson (2000), and Black and Wiliam (1998), represent many of the relative merits of formative and summative assessment. Alternate perspectives do exist, e.g., Dwyer (1998); essentially, however, the dominant discourse is "pro-formative". This perspective is essentially that greater use should be made of assessment as a tool to inform teaching and learning because there is now considerable evidence that such a focus results in achievement gains for all students and higher gains for underachievers (Crooks, 1988; Black and Wiliam, 1998). Accordingly it follows that summative use of assessment, such as for reporting purposes, needs to be held in balance and there is a growing call to ensure that assessments that are currently just used summatively are also analysed for formative purposes.

Teacher Practice in Relation to the "Formative Ideal"

Given the significance of formative practice in improving learning, there is a growing interest in pedagogy that enhances the intellectual engagement between teacher and student. Black and Wiliam's (1998) meta-analysis is a cornerstone of many current assessment literature reviews (see Carr et al., 2000). In a review of literature Black and Wiliam found several common themes, and their overall conclusion was that teacher practice was not ideal:

> - Classroom evaluation practices generally encourage superficial and rote learning, concentrating on recall of isolated details, usually items of knowledge which pupils soon forget.
> - Teachers do not generally review the assessment questions that they use and do not discuss them critically with peers, so there is little reflection on what is being assessed.
> - The grading function is over-emphasised and the learning function under-emphasised.
> - There is a tendency to use a normative rather than a criterion approach, which emphasises competition between pupils rather than personal improvement of each. The evidence is that with such practices the effect of feedback is to teach the weaker pupils that they lack ability, so that they are de-motivated and lose confidence in their own capacity to learn.
>
> (Black and Wiliam,1998, p. 17)

A number of the current Ministry of Education assessment initiatives have been designed to support and improve teacher practice, particularly with respect to formative assessment.

Ministry of Education Assessment Initiatives

Recent initiatives include changes made to the government regulations (National Achievement Guidelines) which require schools to focus more closely on literacy and numeracy, the new literacy and numeracy assessment initiative Assessment Tools for Teaching and Learning (asTTle), the exemplars project, the introduction of the National Certificate of Educational Achievement (NCEA), and the Education Amendment Bill No. 2, which in part requires schools to report in a more detailed manner on educational achievement.

Underlying all these initiatives is the government's intention that more children gain strong learning foundations and that more students participate in and achieve in education (Ministry of Education, 2002). A key platform for achieving these goals has been the development of assessment policies (Assessment White Paper, Ministry of Education, 1999; Information for Better Learning, Ministry of Education, 1999; Assessment: Policy to Practice, 1994) and the associated implementation of initiatives such as asTTle and the exemplars project.

At the time of this survey, these initiatives were still in their early stages. It may be that with the exception of the requirement for primary schools to focus more tightly on numeracy and literacy, the initiatives had had little influence on the teachers at that time.

It is, however, worth noting that more established Ministry of Education assessment initiatives, such as the Assessment for Better Learning Professional Development Contracts (Peddie, 2000), and the Assessment Resource Banks (Hattie and Gilmore, 2000), were starting to have an effect on classroom practice.

Literature Review

A selection of literature relating to classroom assessment practices has been located from New Zealand and overseas authors. The sole focus of some of this research was teachers' assessment practices whilst other relevant information came from broader studies looking at the effects of curriculum reforms.

The following themes, relevant to this research, have been identified: types of assessment tools and strategies used, teachers use of assessment information, the flow of assessment information, usefulness of assessment information, attitudes towards assessment, and the amount of assessment.

Types of Assessment Tools and Strategies Used

Within the studies conducted both in New Zealand and overseas, a range of assessment tools and strategies are identified as being used.

Croft and Reid (1991) focused solely on the use of New Zealand Council for Educational Research published tests in New Zealand schools. Of those tools included in the current survey, they noted the following hierarchy of use by primary teachers:

- Progressive Achievement Test: Listening—90 percent,
- Progressive Achievement Test: Reading—85 percent,
- Burt Word Reading Test—70 percent,

- Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics—51 percent,
- Proof Reading Tests of Spelling—11 percent.

Wylie (1999) also canvassed teacher assessment practices, in the context of a broader enquiry regarding the impact of school reform. Levels of use of the following assessment tools were found at Years 4–6:

- running records—96 percent,
- work samples or portfolios—92 percent,
- spelling tests—88 percent,
- self assessment—85 percent,
- pre-post test*—85 percent,
- Progressive Achievement Tests—82 percent,
- "behavioural" observations—74 percent,
- peer assessment—67 percent,
- Burt tests—58 percent,
- "behavioral" checklists—49 percent,
- National Educational Monitoring Project tasks—9 percent,
- Assessment Resource Banks—2 percent.

At Years 7–8, Wylie (1999) noted the following levels of use:

- work samples—98 percent,
- self assessment—87 percent,
- Progressive Achievement Tests—85 percent,
- running records—83 percent,
- spelling tests—79 percent,
- "behavioural" observations—77 percent,
- pre-post test*—77 percent,
- peer assessment—64 percent,
- Burt tests—42 percent,
- "behavioral" checklists—35 percent,
- National Educational Monitoring Project tasks—12 percent.

Croft, Strafford, and Mapa (2000) surveyed approximately 600 primary teachers on their diagnostic assessment practices in literacy and numeracy. Consequently their findings are primarily related to our data on assessment for teaching and learning. They noted use of tools for diagnostic purposes as follows:

---

* Equates to both teacher developed, and school/syndicate/department developed tests in the current survey.

- for literacy, what Croft et al., (2000) termed "non-formal" methods predominate, i.e., running records (91 percent), observation checklists (84 percent), and teacher-made tests (75 percent);
- for numeracy, "non-formal" methods again predominate, with observation checklists and teacher-made tests reported by more than 90 percent of respondents.

Peddie (2000), within the context of a Ministry of Education funded evaluation of the Assessment for Better Learning professional development contract, found the following rates of assessment use:

- Progressive Achievement Tests—57 percent,
- Assessment Resource Banks—12 percent,
- National Educational Monitoring Project tasks—9 percent.

The Peddie (2000) sample covered New Entrant to Year 13 teachers, with unspecified numbers at each year level, but with the vast majority of respondents being primary school teachers. Whilst the sample of schools in his study were not necessarily representative of the New Zealand school population, the findings still warrant mention in this review.

Renwick and Gray (1995) conducted a case study enquiry of 7 schools involving interviews with all 7 principals and 53 teachers and Board of Trustee members, as well as document analysis. They noted a range of assessment practices (portfolios, external tests, and Progressive Achievement Tests) being used for the purposes of "aggregating data" (p. 47). This context in part parallels the categories in the current study of reporting to school management and external agencies. The authors also noted (but with no reference to the frequency of responses) the use of: observation, self assessment, peer assessment, conferencing, exemplars, tests, and "informal assessment" for purposes other than "aggregating data". They also commented that a wider range of assessment was possible with older students.

Williams (2001), whilst focusing on formative assessment, surveyed the English assessment practices of 30 Year 3 to 8 teachers who had acted as associate teachers for the Auckland College of Education. Williams found that conferencing with regard to written language was practised by all teachers "frequently", and was felt to be useful by all respondents. The majority of teachers did not record anything from their conferencing. She also noted the use of work samples for assessment purposes.

From the overseas studies noted below, a range of foci emerge. However, only the work of Osborn, McNess, Broadfoot, Pollard, and Triggs (2000) is reported in similar detail to that of Croft and Reid (1991), Wylie (1999), and Croft, Strafford, and Mapa (2000).

Osborn, McNess, Broadfoot, Pollard, and Triggs (2000) in a study in the United Kingdom, involving interviews with 128 Year 4–6 teachers from 48 schools, found a range of frequently used practices, including:

- spelling tests—61 percent,
- observation—52 percent,
- teacher developed tasks—52 percent,
- marking of work samples—45 percent,
- mathematics tests—44 percent,
- student self-assessment—34 percent,
- portfolio selection—28 percent,
- standardised tests—15 percent,
- conferencing—11 percent.

Bachor and Anderson (1994) conducted an interview-based enquiry into the assessment practices of a small stratified sample of Canadian primary teachers. They interviewed 40 grade 3/4 teachers and 40 grade 6/7 teachers. (Unless specified, the findings noted from their work do not differentiate between the two data sets). The most widely used form of assessment reported was observation. Other common practices included the use of work samples, tests, and student self-assessment. Tests were more commonly noted by the grade 6/7 sub-sample, and were most frequent for the areas of spelling and mathematics.

Mavromatis (1997) conducted a study into the assessment practices of a sample of 372 Greek primary teachers, and found that observation,[1] oral questioning, textbook tasks, and teacher-made tests (used once or twice weekly by 76 percent of respondents) were the most common data gathering tools.

Teachers' Use of Assessment Information

In addition to documenting the variety of tools and strategies used, a number of studies delved into the uses of assessment data.

Wylie (1999) produced data for uses to which assessment is put (although her data related to all year levels in the primary school sector). Essentially, Wylie found that assessment (spreading across all curriculum areas) was used primarily for teaching and learning, monitoring progress, and reporting to parents, with lower levels of use for reporting to school management and external agencies.

In the assessment of reading, Williams (2001) found that running records were considered a "valuable source of information to identify the level of instruction" (p. 13). She also notes that in a number of instances, running record results were "filed for summative purposes" (p. 13).

Senk, Beckman, and Thompson (1997) provide an overview of the mathematics assessment practices of a group of 19 United States secondary teachers, who were selected from schools that were believed to be relatively supportive of "alternative assessment". They noted that assessment for grading purposes featured strongly in the responses of their participants, with 58 percent of the teachers grading all their assessment

---

[1] Mavromatis noted that whilst this was the most commonly recorded assessment technique during the observation phase of his study, it was noted by only 12 percent of questionnaire respondents.

18

tasks. In terms of grading, they note the following hierarchy of tool use: written tests, quizzes, homework, written reports; and at a lower level of use: oral reports, conferencing, and work samples.

The Flow of Assessment Information

A specific area of focus that emerged from some studies was an investigation of the flow of assessment information to others.

Bachor and Anderson (1994) noted that test results were less commonly reported to parents than they were to the students. Mavromatis (1997) noted that in general, feedback to students was limited, and that written feedback primarily took the form of numerical grades, and to a lesser extent short written comment. Osborn et al. (2000) commented that there was a relative lack of perceived usefulness of the assessments that are passed on from the previous year's teacher, with only 25 percent finding them "very useful". The exception to this was student portfolios.

Although not all studies we considered addressed this issue it is fair to say that both Mavromatis and Osborn et al., raise some concerns regarding the flow of assessment information within the classroom and the school respectively.

Usefulness of Assessment Information

Teacher perceptions of the usefulness of the assessment tools and strategies they use have been the focus of few of the studies reviewed. However, it would seem wise to consider this issue.

Senk, Beckman, and Thompson (1997) report the following hierarchy of teacher perceptions of usefulness for general assessment purposes: tests, written assignments, quizzes, work samples, conferencing.

Osborn et al. (2000) noted that 40 percent of the teachers interviewed perceived assessment to be useful, without differentiating between specific practices.

In terms of subsequent use of assessment data, Renwick and Gray (1995) found that respondents felt that aggregation was more effective at a syndicate level, as opposed to a whole school level.

Attitudes Towards Assessment

Alongside teacher perceptions of the utility of specific assessment practices lies the question of the teachers' relationship with assessment in more global terms, i.e. their confidence in their overall assessment practices, and their attitudes towards assessment.

Wylie (1999) found that teachers felt more happy with both the sufficiency and quality of assessment resources for mathematics than for English, and that confidence was higher for mathematics assessment than for English assessment.

Osborn et al. (2000) noted that 79 percent of those interviewed had either positive, mixed, or neutral feelings about the assessment they are required to do.

Amount of Assessment

Renwick and Gray (1995) noted that the expectation of assessment had increased, and teachers were assessing "too much and too often" (p. 51), and 90 percent of those in Wylie's (1999) study stated that the amount of assessment had increased in the three years preceding the survey.

2 METHODOLOGY

Sampling and Procedure

Using the Ministry of Education's *Directory of New Zealand Schools and Tertiary Institutions*, a stratified random sample of schools was selected. The schools were stratified by decile, area, and school size. Full primary, contributing, intermediate, composite, and secondary schools were all included in the sampling, as were state, state integrated, and private schools. The only type of school that was excluded from the sampling was kura kaupapa Schools, due to the focus of the current study being in part on the assessment of English.

Table 1 shows the total number of schools sampled and questionnaires sent out by each year level.

Table 1

Schools Sampled and Questionnaires Sent by Year Level

	Year 5	Year 7	Year 9	Total
Number of schools	181	179	112	472
Number of questionnaires	400	400	400	1200

In total, 472 schools were sent a letter outlining the project and inviting a random selection of their Year 5, 7, or 9 teachers to participate in the study (*see* Appendix C). The questionnaires, envelopes for completed questionnaires (to ensure confidentiality), reply paid envelope for the return of the questionnaires, and complimentary copy of ***set:*** *Research Information for Teachers* were sent along with the letter. To enable a representation of national proportions (*see* section on "Characteristics of the Schools" for more details), small schools were sent 1 questionnaire, medium schools were sent 2 questionnaires, and large schools were sent 4 questionnaires. Also included were instructions for randomly selecting the teachers who were to be asked to complete a questionnaire (*see* Appendix D). The letter was sent to principals for Years 5 and 7, and the appropriate Head of Department for Year 9. Each school received either English or mathematics questionnaires, at one year level only.

Schools from which there was no reply were sent a follow up fax further requesting their participation (*see* Appendix E). These schools were asked to respond, by reply fax, whether or not they were able to participate, and if they required further questionnaires or information.

Questionnaire Design

Two questionnaires were designed: one for English, and one for mathematics. Although the questions were identical, the externally developed tools listed were those appropriate for each curriculum area. The same questionnaire was given to teachers at all three year levels; and when necessary, appropriate instructions were given for the questions that were not applicable to all year levels.

To gain a picture of the background of the teachers who responded, questions were asked about gender, years teaching, and curriculum and management responsibilities. From a given list, teachers were asked to indicate which assessment tools and strategies they used in their classroom, how frequently they used each tool, and what information they recorded. They were then asked about the intended purpose for each tool—whether it was for providing information for: teaching and learning; monitoring progress; students; parents or caregivers; the next year's teacher; school management; or external agencies. Additionally, they were asked to rate how useful they found each tool to be for its intended purpose: "of little or no use", "of some use", "useful", or "very useful".

The questionnaire asked whether they received feedback from anyone about their students' assessment results, and how useful they found that feedback to be. Teachers were also asked to identify any assessments that they were required to use, but would not if given the choice, and where the requirement came from.

Teachers were then asked if there was a difference in the amount of assessment they did for the different functions or strands of either the English or mathematics curriculum, and also if there was a difference in the amount of assessment they did for the different curriculum areas (all teachers of Year 9 students and teachers of Year 7 students who did not take their class for all curriculum areas were asked not to answer this question). If they responded that there was a difference, they were asked about which was the most and least frequently assessed function, strand, or curriculum area, and the reasons why.

On a 5-point scale from "a lot less" to "a lot more", teachers were asked how much assessment they were doing in all of the curriculum areas, compared with 3 years ago, and on another 5-point scale, from "too little" to "too much", they were asked how they felt about the amount of assessment they were doing in each curriculum area. As the Year 9 teachers who responded to this questionnaire were teachers of either English or mathematics, they responded for that curriculum area only.

The questionnaire finished with some general assessment questions. Teachers were asked if they saw any inconsistencies between their school's assessment policy and their classroom practice, who they went to for advice on assessment issues, and what, if any, assessment tools they would like to see developed for New Zealand classrooms.

Response Rates

A total of 676 questionnaires from 311 schools were received. Table 2 shows the response rates of the schools sampled, by year and questionnaire type.

Table 2

Response Rate of the Schools Sampled

Year 5		Year 7		Year 9	
English %	Maths %	English %	Maths %	English %	Maths %
71	67	62	68	61	59

The overall response rate was 65 percent. An additional 4 percent agreed to participate after the reminder letter, but failed to return their questionnaires, 14 percent replied that they were unable to participate (usually due to other pressures and commitments), and there was no reply to either the original letter or follow-up fax from the remaining 17 percent.

The actual number of questionnaires returned was lower than expected for this number of participating schools, as frequently schools that were sent 2 or 4 questionnaires returned only 1 or 2.

Characteristics of the Schools

Tables 3 and 4 compare the proportions of schools nationally, in our sample, and from whom we received at least one questionnaire, by decile bands and area.

Table 3

Comparison of National, Sample, and Return Data by School Decile

Decile	Nationally %	Sample %	Returned %
1–2	21	20	16
3–4	21	21	18
5–6	19	19	25
7–8	20	20	20
9–10	19	20	21

Compared with the national picture, deciles 1–2 are under-represented in returned questionnaires by 5 percentage points, and deciles 5–6 are over-represented by 6 percentage points. All other decile groups match the national proportion, or differ only by 2–3 percentage points.

Table 4

Comparison of National, Sample, and Return Data by Area

Area	Nationally %	Sample %	Returned %
Main urban	50	51	55
Minor urban	11	14	11
Rural	32	28	25
Secondary urban	7	7	9

Schools in rural areas are under-represented in returned questionnaires by 7 percentage points, and those in main urban areas are over-represented by 5 percentage points.

Characteristics of the Teachers

Table 5 shows the number of the teachers who returned questionnaires, by year level and curriculum area.

Table 5

Number of Teachers Who Responded

Year 5		Year 7		Year 9	
English	Maths	English	Maths	English	Maths
129	117	113	123	95	99

The total numbers of teachers who returned questionnaires at Years 5 and 7 are similar, but the numbers of Year 9 teachers were lower. Given that larger schools did not return as many questionnaires as were sent, and that most secondary schools were in the "large" category, Year 9 returns were more affected by this factor. Industrial action within the secondary sector at the time the questionnaires were sent may have also influenced the number of returns.

The number of questionnaires sent to each school was proportional to school size. Table 6 shows the national proportions of students who attend schools of varying sizes, the proportion of questionnaires sent to schools by school size, and the proportion of teachers who returned questionnaires by school size.

Table 6

Comparison of National, Sample, and Return Data by School Size

	Year 5			Year 7			Year 9		
School Size	Nationally %	Sample %	Returned %	Nationally %	Sample %	Returned %	Nationally %	Sample %	Returned %
Small schools (1–120)	13	13	12	14	14	14	1	1	0
Medium schools (121–350)	44	44	41	36	36	38	9	9	8
Large schools (350+)	43	43	47	50	50	49	90	90	92

The match between the national proportions and the proportions of questionnaires returned by teachers was extremely high, with the greatest variation being only 4 percentage points. Therefore, we can be confident that although return rates were lower for Year 9, the questionnaires returned were proportionally representative of the differently sized schools.

When the teachers who returned questionnaires were looked at by decile and area, it was found that the proportions of English returns by decile were similar to national proportions (see the section on "Characteristics of the Schools"); however, the Year 9 mathematics returns were under-represented at deciles 1–2 and over-represented at deciles 7–8. At almost all years in both English and mathematics, main urban areas were over-represented and rural areas were under-represented.

A number of questions about the teachers and their responsibilities were asked at the beginning of the questionnaire. The gender of the teachers who returned questionnaires is shown in Table 7. (The percentages do not always add to 100, as not all teachers answered this question.)

Table 7

Gender of Teachers Responding

	Year 5		Year 7		Year 9	
	English	Maths	English	Maths	English	Maths
Gender	%	%	%	%	%	%
Female	78	66	71	65	76	58
Male	18	33	29	34	24	41

As would be expected, there was a higher proportion of females than males. However, the difference was smaller in mathematics than it was in English, across all three year levels. The largest difference was for Year 5 English (78 percent female) and the smallest for Year 9 mathematics (58 percent female).

The number of years the respondents had been teaching is shown in Table 8.

Table 8

Years Teaching

	Year 5		Year 7		Year 9	
Years Teaching	English	Maths	English	Maths	English	Maths
	%	%	%	%	%	%
5 or less	39	27	28	27	24	18
6–10	19	15	18	15	17	20
11–20	24	32	30	34	28	38
21 or more	18	26	24	24	31	24

Teachers from each year group were quite diverse in the number of years they had been teaching. However, with the exception of Year 5 English, just over half the teachers had taught for more than 10 years.

Teachers were asked to indicate their level of responsibility in the school. Their responses are shown in Table 9.

Table 9

Teacher's Position of Responsibility Within School

	Year 5		Year 7		Year 9	
	English	Maths	English	Maths	English	Maths
Position in School	%	%	%	%	%	%
1st or 2nd year teacher	19	12	15	13	12	8
Teacher	52	53	40	36	38	45
Middle management[2]	14	17	22	21	49	41
Senior management[3]	13	17	21	29	1	4

At Year 5, 68 percent of the teachers had no management responsibilities. At Year 7, although 56 percent had no management responsibilities, a greater proportion had middle[3] and senior[4] management responsibilities. At Year 9, although once again half the teachers had no management responsibilities, this year had the highest proportion of teachers with middle management responsibilities and the lowest with senior management responsibilities. This probably reflects the secondary school structure, as most of those with senior management responsibilities in secondary schools teach few classes.

---

[2] Middle management included responsibilities such as management/PR units, head of department, curriculum or syndicate leader, senior teachers, and dean.

[3] Senior management included teaching principal and teaching deputy or assistant principal.

When position of responsibility was looked at by gender, it was found that the proportion of male and female respondents were similar for teachers and middle management. However, a significantly greater proportion of the males than the females were in senior management positions.[4]

Tables 10 and 11 show the proportions of teachers who reported that they had curriculum responsibilities over and above their classroom teaching and a summary of what they said those responsibilities were.

Table 10

Teachers With Curriculum Responsibilities

Year 5		Year 7		Year 9	
English %	Maths %	English %	Maths %	English %	Maths %
17	22	36	34	49	52

Table 11

Curriculum Responsibilities Identified

	Year 5		Year 7		Year 9	
Curriculum Responsibility	English %	Maths %	English %	Maths %	English %	Maths %
Responsible for a year group or sub-curriculum area	33	18	29	11	51	69
Curriculum leader or head of Department	19	24	18	30	40	24
Monitor and purchase resources	19	13	18	13	-	-
Member of curriculum or management team	19	12	11	20	-	2
Sole charge	-	3	11	4	-	-
Responsibilities for programme planning	4	6	5	13	2	6
Senior management	4	-	3	-	-	-
School review responsibilities	4	15	3	9	6	-

As Table 10 shows, as the year level increased, so did the proportion of teachers who have additional curriculum responsibilities, with half of the Year 9 teachers citing additional responsibilities. This high proportion is paralleled in the data showing the greater number of Year 9 teachers with middle management responsibilities.

---

[4] 23 % vs. 12%, $\chi^2 = 9.49$; $p<0.01$

At both Year 5 and Year 7, responsibility for either a year group or sub-curriculum area was cited by the greatest proportion of teachers in English (33 percent and 29 percent respectively), whereas in mathematics, being the curriculum leader was cited by the greatest proportion (24 percent and 30 percent respectively). Monitoring and purchasing resources, and being a member of a curriculum or management team, were the other two most commonly reported responsibilities at Years 5 and 7.

At Year 9, most teachers responded that they had responsibilities for either a year group or sub-curriculum area for both English (51 percent) and mathematics (69 percent). Almost all others with curriculum responsibilities cited being the head of department.

Summary of the Teachers Who Responded

Of the 676 teachers who returned questionnaires, 69 percent were female and 31 percent were male. Over half, 56 percent, had been teaching for more than 10 years, and 42 percent held either a middle or a senior management position. A third, 35 percent had curriculum responsibilities, of which the majority cited being responsible for a year group or sub-curriculum area, or being the curriculum leader or head of department.

Although fewer Year 9 questionnaires were received, this did not distort the proportions of returns by school size. The returned questionnaires reasonably matched national proportions of school size.

At the school level, returns were closely representative of the national proportions for decile and area. However, in terms of teachers, there were two main discrepancies. Year 9 mathematics returns were under-represented at deciles 1–2 and over-represented at deciles 7–8. Teachers from main urban areas were over-represented and teachers in rural areas were under-represented for almost all years.

3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In reading the following data, it is important for the reader to be aware that individual teachers have their own definitions of terms such as "observation", "conferencing", and "portfolios". Whilst these definitions have elements of commonality, due to the shared use and construction of educational language, the same term does not necessarily equate to the same process of use for each tool or strategy for all teachers. Similarly, the term "school or teacher developed" means different things to different teachers. An obvious source of variance here is in the extent of inclusion or exclusion, within an individual's definition, of assessment items that are sourced from outside the school, but assembled by teachers within the school, to create a "new" or "school or teacher developed" assessment tool.

Use and Usefulness of the English Tools and Strategies

This section covers the teacher responses from the English questionnaire. A total of 337 teachers returned English questionnaires. This was made up of 129 Year 5, 113 Year 7, and 95 Year 9 teachers.

English Assessment Tools and Strategies Used in the Classroom[5]

Teachers at all three year levels were asked to indicate which of the assessment tools and strategies listed they used with their students. Table 12 shows the percentages of teachers in each year group who used a particular tool.

---

[5] See *References* section for complete reference details of all published tools cited.

Table 12

Teachers' Use of English Assessment Tools and Strategies

Assessment Tools and Strategies	Year 5 %	Year 7 %	Year 9 %
Externally Developed Tools			
Assessment Resource Banks	21	24	20
Burt Word Reading Test	52	61	9
Competition Tests	47	72	58
Graded Word Spelling Test	6	16	5
National Educational Monitoring Project tasks	12	19	3
Neale Analysis of Reading Ability	2	3	3
Peters Spelling Checklist	22	25	3
Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension	86	93	82
Progressive Achievement Test: Reading	90	93	88
Proof Reading Tests of Spelling	22	16	5
Reading Prose Inventory	42	46	10
Schonell Spelling Test	34	43	9
Supplementary Tests of Achievement in Reading	25	14	5
Tests of Reading Comprehension	14	17	9
Teacher or School Developed Tools and Strategies			
Assignments or homework	88	90	98
Checklists or rating scales	63	65	36
Conferencing or interviews	88	88	63
Exams	4	13	84
Exemplars	30	34	62
Observation	92	94	74
Peer assessment	75	82	74
Portfolios or work samples	89	92	63
School developed tests	38	50	81
Student self assessment	80	82	74
Teacher written tests	66	69	37

Note: Data relating to the Essential Skills Assessments: Information Skills has not been included in our analysis as the response patterns indicated that there may have been some confusion in regarding this as being the generic assessment of this essential skill, rather than referring to the specific published series of tests.

Overall, teachers made more use of teacher or school developed tools and strategies than externally developed tools. Progressive Achievement Tests were the only externally developed tools used by more than 80 percent of teachers at all three year levels. By comparison, assignments or homework, conferencing or interviews, exams, observations, peer assessment, portfolios or work samples, school developed tests, and student self assessment were used by 80 percent or more of teachers at at least one year level.

Most of the 11 teacher or school developed tools and strategies were used by over 60 percent of the teachers at most year levels. By comparison, the Burt Word Reading Test, Competition Tests, and Progressive Achievement Tests were the only externally developed tools to reach 50 percent use at at least one year level.

Fewer externally developed tools were used at Year 9, compared with Years 5 and 7. Only 4 externally developed tools were used by 15 percent or more Year 9 teachers, compared with 10 at Year 5 and 12 at Year 7. In part, this reflects the level focus of many of the externally developed English tools—many are designed for use with primary aged students, with their norm data reflecting this focus.

In addition to those listed in the questionnaire, 17 other tools were noted by 31 teachers, with the most common being a variety of spelling tests and PROBE.

Significant Differences in the Uses of the Tools by Year Level

The only tools which did *not* show a significant difference in use when compared by year level were the Assessment Resource Banks, Neale Analysis of Reading Ability, Progressive Achievement Test: Reading, Tests of Reading Comprehension, assignments or homework, peer assessment, and student self assessment.

Significant Differences in the Uses of the Tools by Decile

Significantly fewer teachers in decile 1–3 schools use Competition Tests[6] than those in deciles 4–10, whereas significantly more teachers in decile 8–10 schools use the Proof Reading Tests of Spelling[7] than those in deciles 1–7.

Significant Differences in the Uses of the Tools by Intermediate and Full Primary Schools

Teachers from intermediate schools use the Burt Word Reading Test[8] and assignments or homework[9] significantly more, and the Peters Spelling Checklist[10] significantly less, than teachers in full primary schools.

Significant Differences in the Uses of the Tools by Management Level

Teachers with management responsibilities use Competition Tests[11] and exemplars[12] significantly more, and the Progressive Achievement Test: Reading[13] significantly less, than teachers with no management responsibilities.

Significant Differences in the Uses of the Tools by Length of Teaching

Those who have been teaching for more than five years use the Proof Reading Tests of Spelling[14] significantly more.

Significant Differences in the Uses of the Tools by Area

No significant differences were found when responses were analysed by area (rural, main urban, minor urban, and secondary urban).

---

[6] 45% vs 65%, $x^2 = 9.852$, $p<0.01$

[7] 22% vs 13%, $x^2 = 4.514$, $p<0.05$

[8] 78% vs 51%, $x^2 = 6.201$, $p<0.05$

[9] 100% vs 85%, $x^2 = 4.650$, $p<0.05$

[10] 8% vs 30%, $x^2 = 5.034$, $p<0.05$

[11] 66% vs 54%, $x^2 = 3.870$, $p<0.05$

[12] 51% vs 33%, $x^2 = 10.425$, $p<0.05$

[13] 38% vs 62%, $x^2 = 5.488$, $p<0.05$

[14] 18% vs 9%, $x^2 = 10.836$, $p<0.05$

In comparison with previous research in the New Zealand context, these results are similar to those of Wylie (1999) with the exception of a notably lower response in the current survey for Reading Prose Inventory (42 percent at Year 5, 46 percent at Year 7) compared with running records in Wylie's work (96 percent Years 4–6, 83 percent Years 7–8). This may be a function of the terminology used partly because Reading Prose Inventory is a more formal subset of the range of running record assessments, and partly because some teachers who use a Reading Prose Inventory may be unfamiliar with this term.

The results from the current study also showed similar levels of use of the New Zealand Council for Educational Research's published tests as those found in the Croft et al. (1991) study. In addition, they showed a similar range of tools to that found by Renwick and Gray (1995). The predominant use of what Croft et al. (2000), termed "non-formal methods" was also supported in the broader assessment context, as well as for the diagnostic purposes which were the focus of their study. Although a lower percentage of use was found for the Progressive Achievement Tests in Peddie's (2000), study (which may be in part a factor of his sample), the levels of use of these tests, compared with the Assessment Resource Banks and National Educational Monitoring Project tasks, remains similar.

In the context of British Year 4–6 teachers, Osborn et al. (2000), provide data which shows: lower reported use of assessment tools in general, with conferencing and student self assessment being reported lower down the hierarchy of tools used than in the current study. The caveat with "conferencing" in particular is that it is possible that New Zealand teachers may have responded with a more inclusive definition of the term than their British counterparts.

Bachor and Anderson's (1994) finding that observation was the most widely reported form of assessment was supported by the current study, as was Mavromatis's (1997) finding of high levels of use of observation.

Also worth noting is that since this data was collected, it would appear that the use of the Assessment Resource Banks has increased. The number of "hits" to the English search page have doubled between the time this survey was done, and the time of writing this report (unpublished New Zealand Council for Educational Research data).

It is important to note that from this point, tools not reported as being used by 15 percent or more of teachers for a particular year group have not been included in any of the subsequent tables. For English, this means that data relating to the following assessment tools have been excluded:

Year 5

- Graded Word Spelling Test
- National Educational Monitoring Project tasks
- Neale Analysis of Reading Ability
- Tests of Reading Comprehension
- Exams

Year 7

- Neale Analysis of Reading Ability
- Supplementary Tests of Achievement in Reading
- Exams

Year 9

- Burt Word Reading Test
- Graded Word Spelling Test
- National Educational Monitoring Project tasks
- Neale Analysis of Reading Ability
- Peters Spelling Checklist
- Proof Reading Test of Spelling
- Reading Prose Inventory
- Schonell Spelling Test
- Supplementary Tests of Achievement in Reading
- Tests of Reading Comprehension

Frequency of Use of the English Tools Used

Teachers were asked to identify how often they used each of the assessment tools and strategies. They were asked to select from: once a year, 2-5 times a year, 6-9 times a year, 10-20 times a year, weekly, or daily. The most common response to each tool is summarised in Table 13. (Tables of the complete data can be found in Appendix A.)

Table 13

Most Frequently Chosen Category for Frequency of Use

Assessment Tools and Strategies	Year 5	Year 7	Year 9
Externally Developed Tools			
Assessment Resource Banks	2-5 times (46)	2-5 times (40)	2-5 times (33)
Burt Word Reading Test	2-5 times (61)	2-5 times (68)	
Competition tests such as the Australian tests	Once (90)	Once (87)	Once (98)
Graded Word Spelling Test	-	2-5 times (75)	-
National Educational Monitoring Project tasks	-	Once (55)	-
Peters Spelling Checklist	2-5 times (79)	2-5 times (71)	-
Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension	Once (100)	Once (97)	Once (95)
Progressive Achievement Test: Reading	Once (97)	Once (96)	Once (95)
Proof Reading Tests of Spelling	Once (57)	Once (72)	-
Reading Prose Inventory	2-5 times (74)	2-5 times (77)	-
Schonell Spelling Test	2-5 times (74)	2-5 times (81)	-
Supplementary Tests of Achievement in Reading	Once (74)	-	-
Tests of Reading Comprehension	-	Once (44)	-
Teacher or School Developed Tools and Strategies			
Assignments or homework	Weekly (74)	Weekly (70)	Weekly (41)
Checklists or rating scales	10-20 times (31)	Weekly (39)	10-20 times (39)
Conferencing or interviews	Weekly (41)	Weekly (32)	2-5 times (63)
Exams	-	-	Once (56)
Exemplars	2-5 times (64)	2-5 times (49)	6-9 times (36)
Observation	Daily (61)	Daily (51)	Daily (38)
Peer assessment	Weekly (29)	10-20 times (40)	2-5 times (48)
Portfolios or work samples	2-5 times (39)	2-5 times (42)	2-5 times (49)
School developed tests	2-5 times (58)	2-5 times (51)	2-5 times (48)
Student self assessment	6-9 times (28)	10-20 times (45)	2-5 times (54)
Teacher written tests	10-20 times (43)	10-20 times (42)	6-9 times (40)

Note: The numerals in brackets show the percentages reporting that particular frequency of use.

Tools such as the Progressive Achievement Tests: Reading and Listening showed uniformity in their most common frequency of use, i.e., 95-100 percent. For other tools, the lower the percentage, the more likely it is that there were two or even three frequencies of use selected that were quite close. For example, Student self assessment at Year 5 was most commonly reported as being used 6–9 times a year (28 percent), but the categories 10–20 times a year (27 percent) and 2–5 times a year (26 percent) were extremely similar in frequency.

There was consistency between the years in the most common category chosen for frequency of use, with 12 out of the 18 tools used at more than one year level having the same most common frequency of use.

The most common frequency of use of the externally developed tools was either once or 2–5 times a year. These responses were consistent with the intended usage of the tools, for example, Progressive Achievement Tests are designed to be used only once in any given year, and results were consistent with this.

The teacher or school developed tools and strategies were used much more frequently. Observation was the only tool where daily was the most common response, but weekly and 10–20 times per year did feature frequently for the teacher or school developed tools and strategies. Once again, given the type of assessment, the common responses indicate appropriate usage of the tool or strategy.

Responses also indicate that in any given school term, a large amount of assessment data is being collected. With the exception of Competition Tests, National Educational Monitoring tasks, Progressive Achievement tests, Proof Reading Tests of Spelling, Supplementary Tests of Achievement in Reading, Tests of Reading Comprehension, and exams, many of the other 16 tools and strategies appeared to be used about once a term by those teachers using these tools.

Information Recorded by Teachers

All teachers who stated that they used a particular tool were asked to indicate the information they recorded when using that particular tool. They could select one or more of the following categories: nothing recorded, raw score/percent, grade, curriculum level, normed score, written comment, or other. The categories that were the most frequently chosen by each year group are shown in Table 14.

Table 14

Most Frequently Chosen Category for Information Recorded

Assessment Tools and Strategies	Year 5	Year 7	Year 9
Externally Developed Tools			
Assessment Resource Banks	Raw score/percent (46)	Raw score/percent (30) Curriculum level (30) Written comment (30)	Raw score/percent (53)
Burt Word Reading Test	Raw score/percent (58)	Raw score/percent (56)	-
Competition Tests	Nothing recorded (41)	Raw score/percent (40)	Raw score/percent (35)
Graded Word Spelling Test	-	Raw score/percent (61)	-
National Educational Monitoring Project tasks	-	Nothing recorded (43)	-
Peters Spelling Checklist	Raw score/percent (54)	Raw score/percent (38)	-
Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension	Raw score/percent (81)	Raw score/percent (71)	Raw score/percent (55)
Progressive Achievement Test: Reading	Raw score/percent (79)	Raw score/percent (73)	Raw score/percent (57)
Proof Reading Tests of Spelling	Raw score/percent (74)	Raw score/percent (56)	
Reading Prose Inventory	Raw score/percent (55)	Written comment (56)	-
Schonell Spelling Test	Raw score/percent (52)	Raw score/percent (60)	-
Supplementary Tests of Achievement in Reading	Raw score/percent (71)	-	-
Tests of Reading Comprehension	-	Raw score/percent (53) Written comment (53) Other (53)	-
Teacher or School Developed Tools and Strategies			
Assignments or homework	Written comment (76)	Written comment (69)	Written comment (55)
Checklists or rating scales	Written comment (37)	Curriculum level (41)	Nothing recorded (24)
Conferencing or interviews	Written comment (75)	Written comment (74)	Written comment (50)
Exams	-	-	Raw score/percent (50)
Exemplars	Written comment (43)	Written comment (39)	Nothing recorded (51)
Observation	Written comment (76)	Written comment (78)	Written comment (56)
Peer assessment	Written comment (50)	Written comment (64)	Written comment (60)
Portfolios or work samples	Written comment (79)	Written comment (68)	Written comment (52)
School developed tests	Curriculum level (46)	Raw score/percent (48)	Raw score/percent (70)
Student self assessment	Written comment (67)	Written comment (66)	Written comment (34)
Teacher written tests	Written comment (58)	Written comment (61)	Raw score/percent (64)

Note: The numerals in brackets show the percentages reporting that particular category of information being recorded.

As with the data relating to frequency of use of tools and strategies, the lower the percentage, the more likely it was that there were two or even three types of information recorded that were selected by similar numbers of respondents. For example, school developed tests at Year 7 were most commonly reported as having raw score/percent recorded (48 percent), but grade (46 percent) and curriculum level (39 percent) were reported with similar frequency.

In general, raw score/percent was the most commonly nominated type of information recorded for the externally developed tools. Similarly, written comment tended to predominate for the teacher or school developed tools and strategies. For the majority of tools, the most commonly nominated type of information recorded was consistent across all three year levels.

Use of the English Assessment Information

Teachers were asked what they used each assessment tool and strategy to provide information for. The teachers could select one or more uses from the following categories: teaching and learning, monitoring progress, students, parents or caregivers, next year's teacher, school management, or external agencies. Tables 15 to 20 show the tools and strategies used by 50 percent or more for each given purpose.

Teaching and Learning and Monitoring Progress

Table 15

Tools Used by 50 percent or More of Teachers for Providing Information for Teaching and Learning

Year 5	Year 7	Year 9
Observation (93)	Tests of Reading Comprehension (95)	Assignments or homework (91)
Assessment Resource Banks (92)	Reading Prose Inventory (94)	Assessment Resource Banks (90)
Supplementary Tests of Achievement in Reading (90)	Assessment Resource Banks (93)	School developed tests (89)
Teacher written tests (90)	School developed tests (93)	Teacher written tests (87)
Checklists or rating scales (89)	Assignments or homework (90)	Peer assessment (86)
Reading Prose Inventory (87)	Observation (90)	Checklists or rating scales (85)
Conferencing or interviews (87)	Checklists or rating scales (89)	Observation (84)
Schonell Spelling Test (86)	Teacher written tests (87)	Exemplars (83)
Burt Word Reading Test (85)	Conferencing or interviews (84)	Student self assessment (80)
Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension (83)	Progressive Achievement Test: Reading (83)	Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension (74)
Progressive Achievement Test: Reading (83)	Schonell Spelling Test (83)	Progressive Achievement Test: Reading (74)
Assignments or homework (83)	Peters Spelling Checklist (82)	Conferencing or interviews (73)
School developed tests (83)	Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension (80)	Portfolios or work samples (72)
Peters Spelling Checklist (79)	Graded Word Spelling Test (78)	Exams (70)
Exemplars (78)	Proof Reading Tests of Spelling (78)	
Portfolios or work samples (78)	Exemplars (76)	
Peer assessment (77)	Burt Word Reading Test (75)	
Student self assessment (77)	Peer assessment (71)	
Proof Reading Tests of Spelling (74)	Portfolios or work samples (69)	
	Student self assessment (66)	
	National Educational Monitoring Project tasks (62)	
	Competition Tests (54)	

Note: The numerals in brackets show the percentages of users using the tool for teaching and learning.

Table 16

Tools Used by 50 percent or More of Teachers for Providing Information for Monitoring Progress

Year 5	Year 7	Year 9
School developed tests (90)	Reading Prose Inventory (90)	Teacher written tests (90)
Checklists or rating scales (89)	Checklists or rating scales (89)	Assignments or homework (85)
Teacher written tests (89)	Teacher written tests (86)	Exams (85)
Assessment Resource Banks (88)	Tests of Reading Comprehension (84)	School developed tests (83)
Peters Spelling Checklist (86)	Observation (84)	Observation (79)
Observation (84)	School developed tests (84)	Conferencing or interviews (75)
Schonell Spelling Test (81)	Schonell Spelling Test (83)	Student self assessment (74)
Burt Word Reading Test (80)	Burt Word Reading Test (80)	Peer assessment (73)
Reading Prose Inventory (79)	Peters Spelling Checklist (79)	Portfolios or work samples (72)
Conferencing or interviews (78)	Graded Word Spelling Test (78)	Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension (71)
Exemplars (78)	Proof Reading Tests of Spelling (78)	Checklists or rating scales (71)
Supplementary Tests of Achievement in Reading (77)	Conferencing or interviews (78)	Progressive Achievement Test: Reading (69)
Portfolios or work samples (77)	Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension (75)	Assessment Resource Banks (68)
Progressive Achievement Test: Reading (73)	Exemplars (74)	
Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension (71)	Progressive Achievement Test: Reading (73)	
Proof Reading Tests of Spelling (67)	Assignments or homework (71)	
Assignments or homework (65)	Portfolios or work samples (71)	
Student self assessment (62)	Assessment Resource Banks (63)	
Peer assessment (61)	Student self assessment (59)	
	Peer assessment (50)	

Note: The numerals in brackets shows percentages of users using the tool for monitoring progress.

With the exception of Competition Tests at Year 7, all tools and strategies were used for providing information for teaching and learning by 50 percent or more of those who used them. For providing information for monitoring progress, Competition Tests at all years, National Educational Monitoring Project tasks at Year 7, and Exemplars at Year 9, were the only exceptions.

At Years 5 and 7, the most frequently used tools and strategies for these purposes were a mix of teacher or school developed, and externally developed. At Year 9, the weight was much more toward teacher or school developed tools. As mentioned earlier, few externally developed tools were used by 15 percent or more of Year 9 teachers; those that failed to meet this threshold have been excluded from these further analyses.

The Assessment Resource Banks, teacher written tests, and checklists or rating scales featured strongly at all years for providing information for teaching and learning, as did school developed tests, teacher written tests, and observation for providing information for monitoring progress.

Although the Assessment Resource Banks were used by only between a quarter and a fifth of the teachers surveyed, for those who did use them, providing information for teaching and learning (and monitoring progress at Year 5) appeared to be their primary focus at all year levels. Similarly, the Test of Reading Comprehension, although only reaching 17 percent use at Year 7, appeared to be utilised for both teaching and learning and monitoring progress by nearly all who used it.

Students and Parents or Caregivers

Table 17

Tools Used by 50 percent or More of Teachers for Providing Information for Students

Year 5	Year 7	Year 9
Peer assessment (89)	Assignments or homework (90)	School developed tests (89)
Student self assessment (87)	Peer assessment (85)	Student self assessment (87)
Conferencing or interviews (84)	Conferencing or interviews (84)	Peer assessment (87)
Assignments or homework (80)	Competition Tests (80)	Teacher written tests (84)\
Portfolios or work samples (73)	Student self assessment (79)	Assignments or homework (80)
Teacher written tests (73)	Portfolios or work samples (73)	Exams (80)
Schonell Spelling Test (69)	Exemplars (66)	Conferencing or interviews (78)
Competition Tests (66)	Teacher written tests (66)	School developed tests (77)
School developed tests (63)	Observation (61)	Competition Tests (76)
Observation (62)	Checklists or rating scales (59)	Exemplars (75)
Peters Spelling Checklist (61)	Reading Prose Inventory (58)	Checklists or rating scales (65)
Reading Prose Inventory (57)	Schonell Spelling Test (58)	Portfolios or work samples (65)
Assessment Resource Banks (54)	Graded Word Spelling Test (56)	Assessment Resource Banks (53)
Checklists or rating scales (52)	School developed tests (55)	Observation (51)
	Peters Spelling Checklist (54)	

Note: The numerals in brackets show the percentages of users using the tool for students.

The most frequently used tools and strategies for providing information to students were teacher or school developed, with peer assessment, student self assessment, conferencing or interviews, and assignments or homework featuring strongly at all three year levels. The more informal mode of information gathering and feedback may be influential in teachers' choosing to use these tools, as these features make the information more "low stakes" and less intimidating, and thereby potentially more useful for feeding back to students. They can also often be a starting point for activities such as goal setting, as the assessment has already involved the use of student reflection and has been constructed using language appropriate to the student.

The high percentages of teachers reporting using the tools for providing information to students contrasts with the findings of Mavromatis (1997). He found feedback to students was limited in his study of Greek primary teachers.

Table 18

Tools Used by 50 percent or More of Teachers for Providing Information for Parents or Caregivers

Year 5	Year 7	Year 9
Portfolios or work samples (77)	Assignments or homework (87)	Exams (80)
Assignments or homework (75)	Portfolios or work samples (82)	School developed tests (71)
Reading Prose Inventory (74)	Reading Prose Inventory (75)	Assignments or homework (70)
Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension (70)	Competition tests (74)	Teacher Written Tests (67)
Progressive Achievement Test: Reading (67)	Schonell Spelling Test (65)	Competition tests (64)
Competition tests (68)	Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension (63)	Conferencing or interviews (55)
Peters Spelling Checklist (68)	Progressive Achievement Test: Reading (61)	Portfolios or work samples (55)
Proof Reading Tests of Spelling (67)	Checklists or rating scales (58)	
Schonell Spelling Test (64)	Teacher written tests (57)	
Supplementary Tests of Achievement in Reading (61)	School developed tests (55)	
School developed tests (58)	Peters Spelling Checklist (54)	
Observation (55)	Exemplars (53)	
Burt Word Reading Test (54)	Conferencing or interviews (50)	
Exemplars (54)	Observation (50)	
Conferencing or interviews (53)	Student self assessment (50)	
Teacher written tests (52)		

Note: The numerals in brackets show the percentages of users using the tool for parents and caregivers.

At Years 5 and 7, there was a shift from a predominance of teacher or school developed tools and strategies being used for providing information to students to a greater proportion of externally developed tools being used for providing information to parents or caregivers. At Year 9, the reliance on teacher or school developed tools and strategies for providing information to parents or caregivers remained. This reflects the small number of externally developed tools at Year 9 which met the 15 percent use threshold for inclusion.

Also at Year 9, the number of tools that were used by 50 percent or more to provide information to parents or caregivers was half the number that were used to provide information to students. At Years 5 and 7, the number of tools used for each remained reasonably constant.

The findings of the current study also in part parallel those by Bachor and Anderson (1994), who found that results are more commonly shared with the students than with the parents. The current study found test results from teacher written or school developed tools are more commonly shared with students, but results from externally developed tests are more commonly shared with parents or caregivers.

Next Year's Teacher and School Management

Table 19

Tools Used by 50 percent or More of Teachers for Providing Information for Next Year's Teachers

Year 5	Year 7	Year 9
Reading Prose Inventory (72)	Reading Prose Inventory (71)	Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension (64)
Peters Spelling Checklist (71)	Schonell Spelling Test (69)	Exams (63)
Burt Word Reading Test (63)	Progressive Achievement Test: Reading (67)	Progressive Achievement Test: Reading (62)
Progressive Achievement Test: Reading (58)	Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension (66)	School developed tests (57)
Portfolio or work samples (58)	Peters Spelling Checklist (64)	Assessment Resource Banks (53)
Supplementary Tests of Achievement in Reading (58)	Proof Reading Tests of Spelling (61)	
Portfolios or work samples (58)	Portfolios or work samples (57)	
Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension (57)	Burt Word Reading Test (53)	
Schonell Spelling Test (57)	School developed tests (52)	
Exemplars (51)		

Note: The numerals in brackets show the percentages of users using the tool for next year's teachers.

Table 20

Tools Used by 50 percent or More of Teachers for Providing Information for School Management

Year 5	Year 7	Year 9
Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension (76)	Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension (73)	Progressive Achievement Test: Reading (64)
Progressive Achievement Test: Reading (73)	Progressive Achievement Test: Reading (72)	Exams (64)
Exemplars (73)	Exemplars (71)	Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension (62)
Supplementary Tests of Achievement in Reading (71)	Reading Prose Inventory (62)	School developed tests (57)
Reading Prose Inventory (58)	Schonell Spelling Test (52)	
Proof Reading Tests of Spelling (52)	School developed tests (52)	
Schonell Spelling Test (50)		

Note: The numerals in brackets shows the percentages of users using the tool for school management.

The clear majority of the tools that were frequently used for providing information to next year's teachers and school management were externally developed. The need for more formal, often standardised, information appears to have increased; hence, the Progressive Achievement Tests featured across all three year levels as being frequently used for these purposes.

Spelling tools featured more strongly at Years 5 and 7 for providing information for next year's teacher than at Year 9. Teaching of the basic skills of spelling appears to be given a greater priority in the primary years, and possibly the acquisition of this skill is assumed by Year 9.

It is also interesting to note the decrease in the number of tools which were used by more than 50 percent for these purposes. Only 27 percent and 58 percent of the tools used for providing information for teaching and learning were used for providing information for next years teacher and school management.

External Agencies

No tool was used by 50 percent or more of teachers for providing information to external agencies. Although it would appear that this may not be a particularly high priority for teachers, it may also be that there is simply a lack of suitable tools for this purpose. Reporting to such agencies is also often the responsibility of those in management, who aggregate the data collected at a class level to provide a school-wide picture.

Summary of Uses

By far the most common uses of the assessment tools were to provide information for teaching and learning, monitoring progress, and students. The clear majority of assessment data gathered in the classroom was used for these purposes.

Providing information to parents and caregivers, next year's teachers, and school management were less frequent uses of the information, but were still cited by the majority of teachers. However, providing information to external agencies was noted by only a minority of the teachers. The diminished use of assessment tools for the purposes of reporting to school management and external agencies was also noted by Wylie (1999).

There was a tendency for externally developed tools to be more frequently used for purposes outside the classroom, whereas for purposes within the classroom, more of a mix of teacher or school developed and externally developed tools and strategies was used.

To put these trends together, it would appear that the most frequent use of the assessment information was for purposes within the classroom, and this information was gained most frequently through the use of a mix of tools and strategies. Teachers use assessment tools less frequently for purposes of providing information for those outside of the classroom, and the tools they use most frequently for this purpose tend to be externally developed.

Usefulness of the English Assessment Information

Although the tools and strategies teachers use for varying purposes have been discussed, the critical feature of the tools' usefulness needs consideration. Although some tools may be frequently used, how useful is the information they provide?

Teachers were asked to rate the usefulness of each assessment tool and strategy for each purpose they use it for. They could select one of four possible ratings, these being: "of little or no use", "of some use", "useful", or "very useful". Each rating was subsequently weighted (with an arbitrary weight of: 1 = of little or no use, 2 = of some use, 3 = useful, and 4 = very useful), a mean was calculated, and the tools and strategies were then rank ordered by their usefulness. The tools and strategies that appear in Tables 21 to 27 are those that 50 percent or more of the teachers rated as "useful" or "very useful". The tools and strategies are in rank order, with the mean rating in brackets. The means have been included to provide a measure of usefulness; although they demonstrate the small differences between any two tools ranked next to each other, the differences evident within a table and between tables are of particular interest.

It is also important to note that tools that appear at the bottom of each table were not regarded as the least useful tools overall, as only those tools that were rated as being "useful" or "very useful" by at least 50 percent of the teachers who use that tool for that particular purpose are included in the tables.

Teaching and Learning and Monitoring Progress

Table 21

Rank Order of the Usefulness of the Useful Tools for Providing Information for Teaching and Learning

Year 5	Year 7	Year 9
Observation (3.7)	Exemplars (3.6)	Teacher written tests (3.5)
Reading Prose Inventory (3.7)	Tests of Reading Comprehension (3.6)	Exemplars (3.4)
Conferencing or interviews (3.7)	Conferencing or interviews (3.6)	Assignments or homework (3.4)
Teacher written tests (3.6)	Teacher written tests (3.6)	Conferencing or interviews (3.4)
Exemplars (3.4)	Observation (3.5)	Observation (3.3)
Assessment Resource Banks (3.3)	Reading Prose Inventory (3.4)	School developed tests (3.2)
Checklists or rating scales (3.2)	Checklists or rating scales (3.3)	Exams (3.1)
School developed tests (3.2)	Assessment Resource Banks (3.2)	Checklists or rating scales (3.0)
Peters Spelling Checklist (3.1)	School developed tests (3.2)	Portfolios or work samples (2.9)
Schonell Spelling Test (3.1)	Schonell Spelling Test (3.2)	Assessment Resource Banks (2.9)
Assignments or homework (3.0)	Assignments or homework (3.1)	Student self assessment (2.9)
Supplementary Tests of Achievement in Reading (3.0)	Portfolios or work samples (3.0)	Progressive Achievement Test: Reading (2.8)
Student self assessment (3.0)	National Educational Monitoring Project Tasks (2.9)	Peer assessment (2.8)
Burt Word Reading Test (3.0)	Graded Word Spelling Test (2.9)	Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension (2.8)
Peer assessment (3.0)	Student self assessment (2.9)	
Portfolios or work samples (2.9)	Peer assessment (2.9)	
Proof Reading Tests of Spelling (2.9)	Proof Reading Tests of Spelling (2.8)	
Progressive Achievement Test: Reading (2.8)	Progressive Achievement Test: Reading (2.8)	
Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension (2.7)	Burt Word Reading Test (2.8)	
Competition tests (2.7)	Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension (2.8)	
	Peters Spelling Checklist (2.6)	

Table 22
Rank Order of the Usefulness of the Useful Tools for Providing Information for Monitoring Progress

Year 5	Year 7	Year 9
Reading Prose Inventory (3.8)	Teacher written tests (3.6)	School developed tests (3.5)
Observation (3.6)	Reading Prose Inventory (3.5)	Teacher written tests (3.4)
Teacher written tests (3.5)	Observation (3.4)	Assignments or homework (3.3)
Conferencing or interviews (3.4)	Tests of Reading Comprehension (3.4)	Conferencing or interviews (3.2)
Schonell Spelling Test (3.4)	Assessment Resource Banks (3.4)	Checklists or rating scales (3.2)
School developed tests (3.3)	Checklists or rating scales (3.3)	Observation (3.2)
Checklists or rating scales (3.2)	Conferencing or interviews (3.3)	Exams (3.1)
Exemplars (3.2)	Exemplars (3.3)	Portfolios or work samples (3.0)
Assessment Resource Banks (3.1)	Schonell Spelling Test (3.2)	Exemplars (2.9)
Peters Spelling Checklist (3.1)	School developed tests (3.2)	Progressive Achievement Test: Reading (2.9)
Portfolios or work samples (3.0)	Graded Word Spelling Test (3.1)	Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension (2.8)
Proof Reading Tests of Spelling (3.0)	Portfolios or work samples (3.1)	Assessment Resource Banks (2.8)
Burt Word Reading Test (2.9)	Peters Spelling Checklist (3.1)	Student self assessment (2.6)
Supplementary Tests of Achievement in Reading (2.9)	Assignments or homework (3.0)	
Assignments or homework (2.9)	Proof Reading Tests of Spelling (2.9)	
Competition Tests (2.9)	Progressive Achievement Test: Reading (2.9)	
Progressive Achievement Test: Reading (2.8)	Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension (2.8)	
Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension (2.8)	Burt Word Reading Test (2.8)	
	Student self assessment (2.8)	
	Peer assessment (2.6)	
	National Educational Monitoring Project Tasks (2.5)	

For the purposes of teaching and learning and monitoring progress, very few tools were not rated by more than 50 percent of users as being "useful" or "very useful". The tool that most consistently failed to meet this criteria was Competition Tests. Although they were used by half to three-quarters of the teachers surveyed, it would appear they were not considered useful for teaching and learning and for monitoring progress.

Teacher written tests were a tool that stood out as being frequently used for these purposes at all three year levels, and these were also rated highly for usefulness. Being able to direct a test specifically towards the classes' abilities, requirements, and appropriateness would appear to make this assessment tool particularly well suited to these purposes.

Overall, there was a remarkable similarity across the three years in the tools that were found to be the most useful for teaching and learning and for monitoring progress. Although exemplars and school developed tests were used significantly more by Year 9 teachers, and checklists or rating scales, conferencing or interviews, and teacher written tests, were used significantly more by Year 5 and 7 teachers, the ratings of usefulness were similar across all three year levels. This would indicate that although a tool or strategy may appear to be more associated with use at particular years, those who utilise it outside these years can find it useful in providing information for teaching and learning and for monitoring progress.

At Years 5 and 7, the Reading Prose Inventory was rated highly for both these purposes by those who used it, as well as being frequently used.

The other two externally developed tools that consistently appeared in the top half of the rank order of usefulness for these purposes were the Assessment Resource Banks, particularly at Years 5 and 7, and the Test of Reading Comprehension at Year 7.

Although fewer teachers reported using these tools, those that did appeared to find them useful.

Although there was a mix of teacher or school and externally developed tools and strategies being used for providing information for teaching and learning and for monitoring progress, it would appear that overall, the teacher or school developed tools and strategies were rated as providing more useful information for these purposes.

Students and Parents or Caregivers

Table 23

Rank Order of the Usefulness of the Useful Tools for Providing Information for Students

Year 5	Year 7	Year 9
Conferencing or interviews (3.6)	Conferencing or interviews (3.5)	Exemplars (3.5)
Observation (3.3)	Teacher written tests (3.4)	Checklists or rating scales (3.4)
Student self assessment (3.2)	Tests of Reading Comprehension (3.3)	Conferencing or interviews (3.4)
Reading Prose Inventory (3.2)	Student self assessment (3.2)	School developed tests (3.3)
Teacher written tests (3.2)	Proof Reading Tests of Spelling (3.2)	Teacher written tests (3.3)
Peer assessment (3.1)	Exemplars (3.2)	Assignments or homework (3.3)
Portfolios or work samples (3.1)	Reading Prose Inventory (3.2)	Exams (3.2)
Assignments or homework (3.1)	Assignments or homework (3.2)	Student self assessment (3.1)
School developed tests (3.0)	Peer assessment (3.1)	Observation (3.0)
Peters Spelling Checklist (2.9)	Checklists or rating scales (3.1)	Portfolios or work samples (3.0)
Schonell Spelling Test (2.9)	Observation (3.1)	Peer assessment (3.0)
Checklists or rating scales (2.7)	School developed tests (3.0)	Competition tests (2.6)
Assessment Resource Banks (2.6)	Portfolios or work samples (3.0)	Assessment Resource Banks (2.6)
Proof Reading Tests of Spelling (2.3)	Schonell Spelling Test (3.0)	
	Assessment Resource Banks (2.9)	
	Competition tests (2.8)	
	Peters Spelling Checklist (2.7)	
	Graded Word Spelling Test (2.5)	

Table 24

Rank Order of the Usefulness of the Useful Tools for Providing Information for Parents or Caregivers

Year 5	Year 7	Year 9
Portfolios or work samples (3.3)	Tests of Reading Comprehension (3.5)	Exams (3.3)
Reading Prose Inventory (3.2)	Reading Prose Inventory (3.4)	School developed tests (3.2)
School developed tests (3.0)	Portfolios or work samples (3.4)	Assignments or homework (3.1)
Assignments or homework (3.0)	Teacher written tests (3.3)	Teacher written tests (3.0)
Schonell Spelling Test (3.0)	Observation (3.2)	Portfolios or work samples (3.0)
Conferencing or interviews (3.0)	School developed tests (3.1)	Checklists or rating scales (2.9)
Competition tests (3.0)	Conferencing or interviews (3.1)	Conferencing or interviews (2.9)
Exemplars (2.9)	National Educational Monitoring Project Tasks (3.0)	Progressive Achievement Test: Reading (2.7)
Peters Spelling Checklist (2.9)	Assignments or homework (3.0)	Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension (2.7)
Observation (2.9)	Exemplars (2.9)	Exemplars (2.5)
Teacher written tests (2.9)	Burt Word Reading Test (2.8)	Observation (2.4)
Assessment Resource Banks (2.8)	Schonell Spelling Test (2.8)	
Student self assessment (2.8)	Competition tests (2.8)	
Proof Reading Tests of Spelling (2.8)	Graded Word Spelling Test (2.7)	
Progressive Achievement Test: Reading (2.7)	Checklists or rating scales (2.7)	
Checklists or rating scales (2.7)	Student self assessment (2.7)	
	Assessment Resource Banks (2.5)	
	Peters Spelling Checklist (2.3)	

Although fewer tools were rated as being “useful” or “very useful” for providing information to students and parents or caregivers than for the previous purposes, the majority of tools were still so rated.

Conferencing or interviews stand out as being useful strategies for providing information to students across all three year levels, and they were used for this purpose by around 80 percent of all those who used them. Teacher written tests and student self assessment were also rated consistently across all the years, and the Reading Prose Inventory at Years 5 and 7.

In the context of providing information to students, there was less consistency between the most useful tools and strategies across the years. For example, observation was rated more highly at Year 5, Proof Reading Tests of Spelling at Year 7, and checklists or rating scales at Year 9. The availability of the tools at the various years, and the provision of age-appropriate feedback, may account for some of this variation.

Those tools and strategies that were rated consistently highly across all three years for providing information to parents or caregivers were portfolios or work samples, school developed tests, and assignments or homework. The Reading Prose Inventory was once again rated highly at Years 5 and 7, as were teacher written tests at Years 7 and 9.

There was more consistency between the ratings of usefulness given across the years for providing information to parents or caregivers than to students, but once again there was variation in the percentages who used the tools at each year for this purpose. Therefore, although high numbers did not necessarily use the tools mentioned for the purpose of providing information to parents or caregivers, those who did found them to be useful tools.

Once again, the tools and strategies that were predominant at the top of the lists were teacher or school developed.

Next Year's Teacher, School Management and External Agencies

Table 25

Rank Order of the Usefulness of the Useful Tools for Providing Information for Next Year's Teacher

Year 5	Year 7	Year 9
Reading Prose Inventory (3.4)	Test of Reading Comprehension (3.4)	Exams (3.0)
Peters Spelling Checklist (3.3)	Reading Prose Inventory (3.3)	Progressive Achievement Test: Reading (2.9)
School developed tests (3.1)	Portfolios or work samples (3.1)	School developed tests (2.9)
Exemplars (3.1)	Graded Word Spelling Test (3.0)	Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension (2.9)
Schonell Spelling Test (3.0)	Proof Reading Tests of Spelling (2.9)	Portfolios or work samples (2.7)
Supplementary Tests of Achievement in Reading (2.9)	Peters Spelling Checklist (2.7)	Checklists or rating scales (2.4)
Portfolios or work samples (2.9)	Schonell Spelling Test (2.7)	Observation (2.3)
Burt Word Reading Test (2.8)	School developed tests (2.7)	
Proof Reading Tests of Spelling (2.8)	Progressive Achievement Test: Reading (2.7)	
Checklists or rating scales (2.6)	Teacher written tests (2.7)	
	Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension (2.6)	
	Observation (2.6)	
	Exemplars (2.5)	
	Checklists or rating scales (2.4)	
	Burt Word Reading Test (2.4)	

Table 26

Rank Order of the Usefulness of the Useful Tools for Providing Information for School Management

Year 5	Year 7	Year 9
School developed tests (3.3)	Tests of Reading Comprehension (3.4)	Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension (3.0)
Exemplars (3.3)	Reading Prose Inventory (3.4)	Exams (3.0)
Reading Prose Inventory (3.3)	School developed tests (3.1)	Progressive Achievement Test: Reading (3.0)
Supplementary Tests of Achievement in Reading (3.0)	Graded Word Spelling Test (3.0)	School developed tests (2.9)
Schonell Spelling Test (2.9)	Portfolios or work samples (2.9)	Portfolios or work samples (2.4)
Portfolios or work samples (2.9)	Progressive Achievement Test: Reading (2.8)	Assessment Resource Banks (2.4)
Progressive Achievement Test: Reading (2.9)	Exemplars (2.8)	
Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension (2.8)	Teacher written tests (2.8)	
Peters Spelling Checklist (2.8)	Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension (2.7)	
Competition tests (2.8)	Burt Word Reading Test (2.7)	
Burt Word Reading Test (2.8)	Peters Spelling Checklist (2.6)	
Proof Reading Tests of Spelling (2.6)	Schonell Spelling Test (2.6)	
Checklists or rating scales (2.4)	Checklists or rating scales (2.5)	
Assessment Resource Banks (2.3)		

Table 27

Rank Order of the Usefulness of the Tools for Providing Information for External Agencies

Year 5	Year 7	Year 9
Exemplars (3.5)	Reading Prose Inventory (3.3)	Progressive Achievement Test: Reading (2.8)
Reading Prose Inventory (3.4)	Portfolios or work samples (3.1)	Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension (2.7)
Schonell Spelling Test (3.3)	School developed tests (2.9)	School developed tests (2.7)
School developed tests (3.0)	Progressive Achievement Test: Reading (2.8)	Exams (2.7)
Peters Spelling Checklist (2.8)	Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension (2.8)	Portfolios or work samples (2.7)
Progressive Achievement Test: Reading (2.8)	Teacher written tests (2.7)	Assessment Resource Banks (2.3)
Supplementary Tests of Achievement in Reading (2.8)	Exemplars (2.7)	Competition tests (2.3)
Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension (2.7)	Burt Word Reading Test (2.6)	
Portfolios or work samples (2.6)	Peters Spelling Checklist (2.4)	
Proof Reading Tests of Spelling (2.6)		

Assessment for these three purposes produced lower numbers of tools and strategies which were seen as being "useful" or "very useful" by more than 50 percent of those who used them for these purposes. Providing information for external agencies had the lowest number of all.

In terms of reporting to next year's teachers, the diminished number of tools that reach the 50 percent threshold is mirrored in the findings of Osborn et al. (2000). They note that only 25 percent of teachers find assessments that are passed on from the previous year's teacher to be "very useful".

All of these three purposes showed a shift in the relative ranking of teacher or school developed tools and strategies and externally developed tools, with externally developed tools being more highly rated. At Year 5, the Reading Prose Inventory, school developed tests, exemplars and the Schonell Spelling test were in the top five ranked tools for all three purposes. At Year 7, the Reading Prose Inventory, Test of Reading Comprehension, and portfolios or work samples consistently topped the lists. And at Year 9, although very few tools or strategies reached the criteria for inclusion, exams, Progressive

Achievement Tests: Reading and Listening, school developed tests, and portfolios or work samples were the top five tools for all three purposes.

There is a consistency in the tools and strategies that were rated as useful for all three purposes. The more formal, often standardised tools now became more highly valued. This was especially so for providing information to school management and external agencies, where 63 percent and 69 percent, respectively, of the tools that reached the threshold of usefulness were externally developed. Those tools and strategies which which are based more on a teacher's judgement of a student were rated as being less useful for these purposes than for the other purposes discussed above.

Significant Differences in the Usefulness of the Tools

Significantly more teachers from main urban areas rated assignments or homework "very useful" for teaching and learning[15] and monitoring progress[16] than teachers from rural schools.

Significantly more teachers with management responsibilities than other teachers rated the Assessment Resource Banks[17] as "very useful" for teaching and learning, Competition Tests[18] as "very useful" for reporting to parents, and portfolios or work samples as "very useful" for both teaching and learning[19] and monitoring progress.[20] Significantly fewer teachers with management responsibilities rated teacher written tests[21] as "very useful" for monitoring progress.

It would appear that those with management responsibilities may be placing higher value on tools which can provide school-wide comparisons.

Summary of Usefulness

More tools and strategies were rated as being "useful" or "very useful" by 50 percent or more of those who used them for teaching and learning and for monitoring progress than for any of the other purposes. The majority of tools and strategies used for providing information to students and to parents or caregivers were rated as being "useful" or "very useful" by 50 percent or more of those who used them, but fewer tools and strategies reached this ranking for the purposes of providing information to next year's teachers, school management, and external agencies.

Overall, these results indicate a more positive teacher response than those of Osborn et al. (2000), who found that only 40 percent of the 128 Year 4–6 teachers they interviewed found assessment to be useful. Whilst framed in different language, the overall percentage of tools rated as either useful or very useful across all purposes and all year levels in the current study is indicative of a greater perception of the utility of the assessments used.

---

[15] 44% vs 21%, $x^2=6.337$, $p<0.05$

[16] 39% vs 12%, $x^2=5.754$ $p<0.05$

[17] 56% vs 19%, $x^2=8.067$, $p<0.05$

[18] 26% vs 10%, $x^2= 5.372$, $p<0.5$

[19] 44% vs 26%, $x^2=6.260$, $p<0.05$

[20] 44% vs 26%, $x^2=6.023$ $p<0.05$

[21] 50% vs 67%, $x^2=5.399$, $p<0.05$

Teacher or school developed tools and strategies were the most highly rated tools for providing information for teaching and learning, monitoring progress, students, and parents or caregivers. Externally developed tools and "formal testing" were rated more highly for providing information to next year's teachers, school management, and external agencies. The issues of accountability and reporting may have an effect here. Performance on a formal or standardised test can be used comparatively by turning it into a standard or normed score, and the validity and reliability of the test has already been shown by the test developers. In contrast, the ability to target students' needs through teacher developed tools and strategies results in information highly relevant to classroom based needs.

Summary of English Tools and Strategies

The most commonly used English assessment tools and strategies were those developed by the teacher or school, and a number of these tools appear to be used at least once a term by many teachers. The most common use of the information was for purposes within the classroom, and the number of tools providing useful information was also the greatest for these classroom based purposes. Purposes beyond the classroom were more frequently catered for with externally developed tools, and these tools were rated more highly for usefulness than teacher or school developed tools and strategies for these purposes.

Overall, the most frequently used tools and strategies for the various purposes were also rated as being useful. Of the seven purposes for assessment surveyed in this study, and across all three years, the top rated (or one of the top if two or more were equally rated) tool or strategy failed on only four occasions to be within the four most frequently used. On only three occasions were any of the five most frequently used tools and strategies not rated as useful or very useful by 50 percent or more of those who used each of them.

One tool that was used by only 17 percent of Year 7 teachers, but was consistently rated among the most useful for all purposes, was the Tests of Reading Comprehension. Although the small number of users may have had an effect on the mean rating, the consistency of its high rating may warrant consideration of this tool by others.

Ideally, assessment tools and strategies can provide useful information for a variety of purposes. The more purposes a tool or strategy can fulfil, the greater its potential must be to decrease the pressure on a teacher, as it reduces the number of assessments needed to fulfil all their assessment requirements. However, each purpose may still have tools or strategies unique to that purpose. The tools and strategies that were rated as being "useful" or "very useful" by 50 percent or more for all seven purposes are listed below.

At Year 5:

- Reading Prose Inventory
- Schonell Spelling Test

- School developed tests
- Peters Spelling Checklist
- Portfolios or work samples
- Proof Reading Tests of Spelling.

At Year 7:

- Reading Prose Inventory
- School developed tests
- Teacher developed tests
- Exemplars, portfolios or work samples
- Peters Spelling Checklist.

At Year 9:

- School developed tests
- Portfolios or work samples
- Exams.

Although some tools and strategies were more frequently used by certain year groups, such as checklists or rating scales and teacher written tests at Years 5 and 7, all those who use them rated their usefulness similarly highly. Therefore, if a tool or strategy is used well, its applicability and usefulness can spread across a greater number of years than perhaps teachers are aware of.

Use and Usefulness of the Mathematics Tools and Strategies

This section covers the teacher responses from the mathematics questionnaire. As was reported in section 2, the total number of teachers who returned mathematics questionnaires was 339. This was made up of 117 Year 5, 123 Year 7, and 99 Year 9 teachers.

Mathematics Assessment Tools and Strategies Used in the Classroom[22]

All three year levels of teachers were asked to indicate which of the assessment tools and strategies listed they used with their students. Table 28 shows the percentages of tools used by each year group.

Table 28

Teachers' Use of Mathematics Assessment Tools and Strategies

Assessment Tools and Strategies	Year 5 %	Year 7 %	Year 9 %
Externally Developed Tools			
Assessment Resource Banks	34	39	22
Beginning School Mathematics	4	2	2
Booker Profiles in Mathematics	0	2	2
Competition Tests	57	66	79
National Educational Monitoring Project tasks	16	20	7
Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics	80	84	63
Topic and Strand-based Tests	55	40	13
Teacher or School Developed Tools and Strategies			
Assignments or homework	84	86	97
Checklists or rating scales	60	57	18
Conferencing or interviews	77	75	29
Exams	7	13	84
Exemplars	13	13	18
Observation	91	87	58
Peer assessment	53	51	16
Portfolios or work samples	79	70	37
School developed tests	63	66	89
Student self assessment	69	70	30
Teacher written tests	75	83	76

Once again, teachers made more use of teacher or school developed tools and strategies than of externally developed tools. Of the teacher or school developed tools and strategies, assignments or homework, conferencing or interviews, exams, observation, portfolios or work samples, school developed tests, student self assessment, and teacher written tests were used by at least 70 percent of the teachers at at least one year level. Of the externally developed tools, the Progressive Achievement Test and Assessment Resource Banks were widely used at the primary level, as were Competition Tests at the secondary level.

---

[22] See *References* section for complete reference details of all published tools cited.

In addition to those listed in the questionnaire, 13 other tools were noted by 26 teachers, with the most common being the revision tests in the National Curriculum texts.

Significant Differences in the Uses of the Tools by Year Level

When Years 5 and 7 were compared to Year 9, the only tools that showed *no* significant differences were Beginning School Mathematics, Booker Profiles in Mathematics, exemplars, and teacher written tests.

Significant Differences in the Uses of the Tools by Decile

Teachers in decile 1–3 schools used portfolios or work samples,[23] peer assessment,[24] student self assessment,[25] and conferencing or interviews[26] significantly more, and Competition Tests[27] significantly less, than those in deciles 4–10 schools.

Teachers in decile 8–10 schools used the Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics[28] significantly more, and Topic- and Strand-based Tests[29] significantly less, than those in deciles 1–7 schools.

Significant Differences in the Uses of the Tools by Intermediate and Full Primary Schools

Significantly more teachers of Year 7 students in full primary schools used National Educational Monitoring Project tasks,[30] Topic and Strand-based Tests,[31] and conferencing,[32] than those in intermediate schools.

Significant Differences in the Uses of the Tools by Management Level

Significantly more teachers with management responsibilities used the Assessment Resource Banks[33] and National Educational Monitoring Project tasks[34] than did teachers with no responsibilities.

---

[23] 86% vs. 60%; $\chi^2 = 15.984$, $p < 0.01$
[24] 59% vs. 39%; $\chi^2 = 9.32$, $p < 0.01$
[25] 73% vs. 57%; $\chi^2 = 7.091$, $p < 0.01$
[26] 77% vs. 60%; $\chi^2 = 6.353$, $p < 0.05$
[27] 73% vs. 45%; $\chi^2 = 15.215$, $p < 0.01$
[28] 92% vs. 70%; $\chi^2 = 16.495$, $p < 0.01$
[29] 27% vs. 42%; $\chi^2 = 5.899$, $p < 0.05$
[30] 28% vs. 10%; $\chi^2 = 4.283$, $p < 0.05$
[31] 53% vs. 21%; $\chi^2 = 9.6$, $p < 0.01$
[32] 89% vs. 62%; $\chi^2 = 5.347$, $p < 0.05$
[33] 43% vs. 23%; $\chi^2 = 13.254$, $p < 0.01$
[34] 22% vs. 10%; $\chi^2 = 9.06$, $p < 0.01$

Significant Differences in the Uses of the Tools by Length of Teaching

Those who had been teaching for 5 years or less used student self assessment[35] significantly more, and those who had been teaching for 14 years or less use checklists or rating scales[36] more.

Significant Differences in the Uses of the Tools by Area

No significant differences were found when responses were analysed by area (rural/main urban/minor urban/secondary urban).

In comparison with previous New Zealand research, the levels of tool use in part parallel the data Wylie (1999) gathered from Year 4–6 and Year 7–8 teachers. Wylie (1999), however, reports lower response rates for assignments or homework; conferencing or interviewing, exams, and Competition Tests. The difference in the latter two cases may be, respectively, a function of the primary school focus of her work, and the relative novelty of Competition Tests at the time her data was gathered.

The current study found similar levels of use to Croft et al. (2000), with non-formal methods predominating once again. Although lower levels of use were found for the Progressive Achievement Test, Assessment Resource Banks, and National Educational Monitoring Project tasks than were found by Peddie (2000), relative use of each was similar. Much higher levels of use of the Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics now, compared with that found by Croft and Reid in 1991, can probably be accounted for by the 1993 revision of that test.

In relation to overseas data, the Year 9 data from the current study shows a similar hierarchy to the United States high school study by Senk et al. (1997), where tests predominate over more informal methods of assessment. The current study also found similar patterns to Bachor and Anderson (1994), and Mavromatis (1997). Higher levels of use of all the tools were found in the current study than those found in the United Kingdom by Osborn et al. (2000).

Teachers from lower decile schools reported significantly more use of a number of teacher and school developed tools and strategies (portfolios or work samples, peer and self assessment, and conferencing or interviews), whereas teachers from higher decile schools reported more use of two of the externally developed, purchased tools (Competition Tests and Progressive Achievement Test). Issues beyond financial implications, such as appropriateness and applicability of content, difficulty, student anxiety, and student English language levels may all have an impact on a school's choice of tools.

Also worth noting, as with the use of the English Assessment Resource Banks, the number of "hits" to the mathematics search page have doubled between the time the survey was sent and the time of writing this report (unpublished New Zealand Council for Educational Research data).

---

[35] 70% vs. 54%; $\chi^2 = 7.261$, $p < 0.01$

[36] 53% vs. 40%; $\chi^2 = 5.46$, $p < 0.05$

It is important to note that from this point, tools not reported as being used by 15 percent or more of teachers for a particular year group have not been included in any of the subsequent tables. For mathematics, this meant that data relating to the following assessment tools have been excluded:

Year 5
- Beginning School Mathematics
- Booker Profiles in Mathematics
- Exams
- Exemplars

Year 7
- Beginning School Mathematics
- Booker Profiles in Mathematics
- Exams
- Exemplars

Year 9
- Beginning School Mathematics
- Booker Profiles in Mathematics
- National Educational Monitoring Project tasks
- Topic- and Strand-based Tests

Frequency of Use of the Mathematics Tools Used

Teachers were asked to select how often they used each of the assessment tools and strategies from the following: once a year, 2–5 times a year, 6–9 times a year, 10–20 times a year, weekly, or daily. The most common response for each tool is summarised in Table 29. (Tables of the complete data can be found in Appendix B.)

Table 29

Most Frequently Chosen Category for Frequency of Use

Assessment Tools and Strategies	Year 5	Year 7	Year 9
Externally Developed Tools			
Assessment Resource Banks	2–5 times (54)	2–5 times (43)	2–5 times (45)
Competition tests	Once (97)	Once (43)	Once (60)
National Education Monitoring Project tasks	2–5 times (47)	Once (43)	–
Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics	Once (92)	Once (96)	Once (98)
Topic and Strand-based Tests	6–9 times (31)	6–9 times (44)	–
Teacher or School Developed Tools and Strategies			
Assignments or homework	Weekly (71)	Weekly (63)	Daily (45)
Checklists or rating scales	10–20 times (43)	10–20 times (38)	2–5 times (33)
Conferencing or interviews	2–5 times (24) Weekly (24)	2–5 times (27)	2–5 times (57)
Exams	–	–	2–5 times (49)
Exemplars	–	–	2–5 times (33)
Observation	Daily (65)	Daily (54)	Daily (68)
Peer assessment	2–5 times (31)	2–5 times (27)	2–5 times (38) 10–20 times (38)
Portfolios or work samples	2–5 times (54)	2–5 times (48)	2–5 times (34)
School developed tests	2–5 times (55)	6–9 times (36)	6–9 times (45)
Student self assessment	2–5 times (30)	2–5 times (30)	2–5 times (34)
Teacher written tests	10–20 times (43)	10–20 times (45)	2–5 times (32)

Note: The numerals in brackets show the percentages reporting that particular frequency of use.

Tools such as Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics showed consistency in their most commonly selected frequency of use—92 percent, 96 percent, and 98 percent. However, the lower the percentage figure for a given tool, the more likely that there were two or even three frequency of use categories selected by similar numbers of teachers. For example, the Topic- and Strand-based Tests at Year 5 were most commonly reported as being used 6–9 times a year (31 percent), but the categories of 10–20 times a year (28 percent) and 2–5 times a year (25 percent) were similarly reported.

Teacher or school developed tools and strategies were used more frequently than externally developed tools, with observation being commonly used on a daily basis. The most common response was 2–5 times per year, but responses were frequently spread across a number of categories. This would appear to indicate that there was variety in the number of times per year different teachers utilised many of the tools and strategies. Even given this, with the exception of Competition Tests, National Educational Monitoring tasks, and the Progressive Achievement Test, the other 13 tools and strategies all appeared to be used close to once a term by those teachers using them.

There was a consistency across the years in the most common category chosen for frequency of use, with 8 out of the 12 tools used at all three years having the same most commonly selected category for frequency of use. Of those tools and strategies which varied across the years, teachers of Year 9 students commonly reported using assignments or homework daily, rather than weekly, and checklists or rating scales and teacher written tests 2–5 times per year, rather than 10–20 times per year. Teachers of Year 5 students commonly reported using school developed tests only 2–5 times per year, compared with 6–9 times per year for Years 7 and 9.

Information Recorded by Teachers

Teachers who stated that they used a particular tool or strategy were asked to indicate the information they recorded from the following categories: nothing recorded, raw score/percent, grade, curriculum level, normed score, written comment, or other. The categories that were the most frequently chosen by each year group are shown in Table 30.

Table 30

Most Frequently Chosen Category for Information Recorded

Assessment Tools and Strategies	Year 5	Year 7	Year 9
Externally Developed Tools			
Assessment Resource Banks	Curriculum level (51)	Raw score/percent (53)	Raw score/percent (50)
Competition Tests	Nothing recorded (39)	Raw score/percent (56)	Nothing recorded (43)
National Education Monitoring Project tasks	Written comment (42)	Nothing recorded (44)	–
Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics	Raw score/percent (77)	Raw score/percent (75)	Raw score/percent (69)
Topic and Strand-based Tests	Raw score/percent (53)	Raw score/percent (55)	-
Teacher or School Developed Tools and Strategies			
Assignments or homework	Raw score/percent (23)	Raw score/percent (30)	Raw score/percent (42)
Checklists or rating scales	Raw score/percent (34)	Raw score/percent (39)	Curriculum level (33)
Conferencing or interviews	Nothing recorded (20)	Nothing recorded (30)	Nothing recorded (25)
Exams	–	–	Raw score/percent (83)
Exemplars	–	–	Nothing recorded (28)
Observation	Nothing recorded (25)	Nothing recorded (24)	Nothing recorded (44)
Peer assessment	Nothing recorded (34)	Nothing recorded (29)	Nothing recorded (38)
Portfolios or work samples	Raw score/percent (37)	Curriculum level (38)	Grade (31)
School developed tests	Raw score/percent (67)	Raw score/percent (66)	Raw score/percent (77)
Student self assessment	Raw score/percent (19)	Nothing recorded (21)	Nothing recorded (52)
Teacher written tests	Raw score/percent (60)	Raw score/percent (67)	Raw score/percent (74)

Note: The numerals in brackets show the percentages reporting that particular category of information being recorded.

For a number of the assessment tools and strategies, even the most frequently selected category received a low percentage response. For example, for observation, nothing recorded was chosen by 25 percent. This may be because teachers did not always indicate the information they recorded. For conferencing or interviews at Year 5, the total percentage who indicated that they recorded any type of information was 42 percent. This indicates that around 58 percent made no response for this assessment tool or strategy. (This percentage is indicative only, as respondents could select more than one category). In most cases where the overall figure is low, the category of nothing recorded has been one of the top three choices, e.g., observation at Years 5, 7, and 9.

Overall, there appears to be a similarity between the categories selected by teachers of different year groups as the most commonly recorded information. The most commonly recorded information at Year 5 and 7 was raw score/percent, whilst at Year 9 it was both raw score/percent and nothing recorded. Interestingly, there were only two tools where written comment was selected by more than 4 percent of the teachers: Assessment Resource Banks (19 percent) and National Educational Monitoring Project tasks (33 percent).

Although raw score/percent was the most commonly selected category for teacher and school developed tools, nothing recorded was reported at all year levels for a number of tools and strategies, most notably between a quarter and a half of teachers for conferencing or interviews, observation, and peer assessment.

Therefore, although observation was most commonly used daily at all year levels, many teachers did not formally record anything. The information observed no doubt contributed to a teacher's professional judgment in the overall assessment of the students, and to the recording of progress in documents such as reports.

Teachers' Use of the Mathematics Assessment Information

Teachers were asked to select the purpose for which each assessment tool and strategy was used to provide information: teaching and learning, monitoring progress, students, parents or caregivers, next year's teacher, school management, or external agencies. Tables 31 to 37 show the tools and strategies used by 50 percent or more for each given purpose.

Teaching and Learning and Monitoring Progress

Table 31

Tools Used by 50 percent or More of Teachers for Providing Information for Teaching and Learning

Year 5	Year 7	Year 9
Assessment Resource Banks (95)	Topic- and Strand-based Tests (96)	Teacher written tests (92)
Teacher written tests (94)	Checklists or rating scales (94)	Assessment Resource Banks (91)
Observation (94)	Observation (94)	Assignments or homework (87)
Conferencing or interviews (93)	Assignments or homework (93)	School developed tests (83)
National Educational Monitoring Project tasks (89)	Assessment Resource Banks (91)	Observation (81)
Topic- and Strand-based Tests (89)	School developed tests (91)	Conferencing or interviews (79)
Checklists or rating scales (89)	Teacher written tests (90)	Checklists or rating scales (78)
Assignments or homework (84)	Conferencing or interviews (86)	Exemplars (78)
Peer assessment (79)	Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics (78)	Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics (76)
Student self assessment (79)	Portfolios or work samples (76)	Portfolios or work samples (72)
Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics (78)	Student self assessment (76)	Exams (66)
School developed tests (75)	Competition Tests (72)	Peer assessment (63)
Portfolios or work samples (71)	Peer assessment (71)	Student self assessment (62)
Competition Tests (59)	National Educational Monitoring Project tasks (68)	

Note: The numerals in brackets show the percentages of users using the tool for teaching and learning.

Table 32

Tools Used by 50 percent or More of Teachers for Providing Information for Monitoring Progress

Year 5	Year 7	Year 9
Teacher written tests (97)	Checklists or rating scales (88)	School developed tests (90)
Checklists or rating scales (91)	Observation (87)	Exams (85)
Observation (89)	Teacher written tests (87)	Teacher written tests (84)
Topic- and Strand-based Tests (86)	Topic- and Strand-based Tests (86)	Observation (74)
School developed tests (84)	School developed tests (84)	Checklists or rating scales (72)
Conferencing or interviews (82)	Portfolios or work samples (77)	Assignments or homework (71)
Assessment Resource Banks (79)	Assessment Resource Banks (74)	Portfolios or work samples (69)
Portfolios or work samples (76)	Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics (74)	Assessment Resource Banks (68)
Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics (75)	Assignments or homework (74)	Exemplars (67)
Student self assessment (73)	Conferencing or interviews (73)	Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics (61)
Assignments or homework (72)	Student self assessment (72)	Conferencing or interviews (61)
Peer assessment (71)	Competition Tests (62)	Student self assessment (55)
National Educational Monitoring Project tasks (58)	Peer assessment (56)	
	National Educational Monitoring Project tasks (52)	

Note: The numerals in brackets show the percentages of users using the tool for monitoring progress.

With the exception of Competition Tests at Year 9, all tools and strategies were used for providing information for teaching and learning by 50 percent or more of those who used them. For providing information for monitoring progress, the only exceptions were Competition Tests at Year 5, and peer assessment and Competition Tests at Year 9.

The most frequently used tools and strategies for these purposes tended to be teacher or school developed. This may in part reflect the few externally developed tools teachers reported using at all. There were 11 commonly used teacher or school developed tools and strategies, but only between 2 and 5 commonly used externally developed tools. However, even given this, most of the top few tools were teacher or school developed.

The exceptions were the Assessment Resource Banks and Topic- and Strand-based Tests. The Assessment Resource Banks were commonly used at all years for providing information for teaching and learning, and Topic- and Strand-based Tests were commonly used at Years 5 and 7 for providing information for teaching and learning and for monitoring progress. Although only between a third and a half of the teachers used these tools, for those who did, these were common purposes.

Teacher written tests, observation, conferencing or interviews, checklists or rating scales, and assignments or homework featured strongly at all years for providing information for teaching and learning—teacher written tests, observation, and checklists or rating scales featured strongly for providing information for monitoring progress.

As with the English results, high levels of use of exams at Year 9 for monitoring progress was consistent with their common summative focus.

Students and Parents or Caregivers

Table 33

Tools Used by 50 percent or More of Teachers for Providing Information for Students

Year 5	Year 7	Year 9
Student self assessment (94)	Peer assessment (89)	Teacher written test (89)
Peer assessment (89)	Student self assessment (88)	School developed tests (89)
Conferencing or interviews (89)	Assignment or homework (87)	Exams (87)
Assignments or homework (88)	Conferencing or interviews (86)	Student self assessment (86)
Teacher written test (85)	Competition Tests (84)	Assignment or homework (82)
Portfolios or work samples (84)	Teacher written test (81)	Peer assessment (81)
Topic and Strand-based Tests (75)	Topic and Strand-based Tests (80)	Conferencing or interviews (79)
Competition Tests (71)	Portfolios or work samples (79)	Portfolios or work samples (75)
Observation (70)	School developed tests (78)	Checklists or rating scales (72)
Checklists or rating scales (67)	Checklists or rating scales (70)	Competition Tests (71)
School developed tests (64)	Observation (65)	Exemplars (67)
Assessment Resource Banks (56)	Assessment Resource Banks (57)	Assessment Resource Banks (55)
		Observation (53)

Note: The numerals in brackets show the percentages of users using the tool for students.

The Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics was not commonly used for providing information for students at any year. National Educational Monitoring Project tasks at Years 5 and 7 was the only other tool not commonly used for this purpose.

Student self assessment, peer assessment, conferencing or interviews, assignments or homework, and teacher written tests all featured strongly for providing information for students. Once again, teacher or school developed tools and strategies were more commonly used than externally developed tools for providing information for students.

The same issues regarding the possible reasons for teachers' choices as those discussed for English may also apply here.

Once again, high percentages of teachers used assessment information for providing information to students in contrast with the findings of Mavromatis (1997).

Table 34

Tools Used by 50 percent or More of Teachers for Providing Information for Parents or Caregivers

Year 5	Year 7	Year 9
Portfolios or work samples (87)	Portfolios or work samples (88)	Exams (90)
Competition Tests (86)	Competition Tests (81)	School developed tests (84)
Assignments or homework (84)	Assignments or homework (80)	Assignments or homework (76)
Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics (71)	Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics (76)	Conferencing or interviews (71)
School developed tests (64)	School developed tests (70)	Portfolios or work samples (67)
Topic and Strand-based Tests (63)	Topic and Strand-based Tests (67)	Checklists or rating scales (61)
Checklists or rating scales (63)	Conferencing or interviews (65)	Exemplars (61)
Teacher written tests (63)	Teacher written tests (61)	Competition Tests (52)
Student self assessment (59)	Student self assessment (57)	
Conferencing or interviews (57)	Observation (59)	
Observation (56)	Checklists or rating scales (54)	
	Assessment Resource Banks (51)	

Note: The numerals in brackets show the percentages of users using the tool for parents or caregivers.

For providing information to parents or caregivers, assignments or homework featured strongly across all three years, with portfolios or work samples and Competition Tests featuring more strongly at Years 5 and 7, and exams and school developed tests more strongly at Year 9. As also found in English, there was a shift to more "test" types of tools for this purpose, compared with the purpose of providing information for students. The Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics, school developed tests, Competition Tests, and Topic- and Strand-based Tests all feature among the six most commonly used tools at Years 5 and 7.

As also found for English, the number of tools used by 50 percent or more to provide information to parents or caregivers at Year 9 was almost half the number used to provide information to students. At Years 5 and 7, the number of tools remained reasonably constant.

Next Year's Teacher and School Management

Table 35

Tools Used by 50 percent or More of Teachers for Providing Information for Next Year's Teachers

Year 5	Year 7	Year 9
Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics (70)	Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics (69)	Exams (66)
School developed tests (64)	Portfolios or work samples (65)	School developed tests (57)
Portfolios or work samples (58)	School developed tests (61)	Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics (53)
Topic- and Strand-based Tests (55)	Topic- and Strand-based Tests (55)	Checklists or rating scales (50)
Checklists or rating scales (53)	Checklists or rating scales (51)	

Note: The numerals in brackets show the percentages of users using the tool for next year's teacher.

Table 36

Tools Used by 50 percent or More of Teachers for Providing Information for School Management

Year 5	Year 7	Year 9
Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics (75)	Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics (81)	Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics (58)
School developed tests (68)	School developed tests (61)	Exams (56)
Assessment Resource Banks (56)	Topic- and Strand-based Tests (59)	
Competition Tests (53)	Portfolios or work samples (56)	
Portfolios or work samples (52)	Assessment Resource Banks (55)	
Topic- and Strand-based Tests (50)		

Note: The numerals in brackets show the percentages of users using the tool for school management.

The Progressive Achievement Test and school developed tests were used by 50 percent or more of the teachers at all years for providing information to next year's teachers and school management, with the exception of school developed tests, which were used by 43 percent for school management at Year 9. At Years 5 and 7, portfolios or work samples and Topic- and Strand-based Tests were frequently used for both purposes, as were Exams at Year 9.

With the exception of portfolios or work samples and checklists or rating scales, all the frequently used assessments for these purposes were more formal "tests". As with English, it appears that for those teachers who used assessment for these purposes, the need for a more formal, quantitative result was important.

Although the number of tools and strategies frequently used for providing information to next year's teachers were similar at all years, fewer tools and strategies were used at Year 9 for providing information for school management. This would seem to imply that fewer tools and strategies were being used at Year 9 for providing information to school management than at Years 5 and 7.

The responses in relation to these purposes have followed the same pattern as English, with fewer tools reaching the 50 percent level of use. Only between 14 percent and 36 percent of the tools used for providing information for teaching and learning were used for providing information for next year's teachers and for school management. As in English, teachers' use of assessment information would appear to be much more focused on classroom purposes than on the provision of information for others.

External Agencies

Table 37

Tools Used by 50 percent or More of Teachers for Providing Information for External Agencies

Year 5	Year 7
Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics (55)	National Educational Monitoring Project tasks (56)
School developed tests (51)	Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics (53)
	Portfolios or work samples (51)

Note: The numerals in brackets show the percentages of users using the tool for external agencies.

No tool or strategy was used by more than 50 percent of the Year 9 teachers for providing information for external agencies, and only two at Year 5 and three at Year 7. The only tool used across Years 5 and 7 was the Progressive Achievement Test.

Summary of Uses

As with English, providing information for teaching and learning, monitoring progress, and students were the most common purposes of the assessment tools and strategies. Almost all assessment undertaken in the classroom was used for these purposes.

Providing information to parents and caregivers, next year's teachers, and school management were less frequently cited purposes, but were still cited by a majority of those who used the tools and strategies. Providing information to external agencies, as with English, was the least common use of the assessment information.

These findings once again support those of Wylie (1999), where a diminished use of assessment for reporting to external agencies was noted.

Overall, it would appear that the most frequent use of the assessment information was for purposes within the classroom, and this information was gained most frequently through the use of teacher or school developed tools and strategies. Although teachers use assessment tools less frequently for purposes of providing information for those outside of the classroom, the tools they use more frequently tend to be externally developed. Also, Year 9 teachers appear to use fewer tools for purposes outside the classroom than do Year 5 and 7 teachers.

Usefulness of the Mathematics Assessment Information Gained

Teachers were asked to rate the usefulness of each assessment tool and strategy for each purpose they use it for. They could select one of four possible ratings, these being: "of little or no use", "of some use", "useful", or "very useful". As in English, each rating was subsequently weighted (with an arbitrary weight of: 1 = of little or no use, 2 = of some use, 3 = useful, and 4 = very useful), a mean was calculated, and the tools and strategies were then rank ordered by their usefulness. The tools and strategies that appear in Tables 39 to 45 are those that 50 percent or more of the teachers rated as "useful" or "very useful". The tools and strategies are in rank order and the mean rating is in brackets. The means have been included to provide a measure of usefulness. Although they demonstrate the small differences between any two tools ranked next to each other, the differences evident within a table and between tables are of particular interest.

It is also important to note that tools and strategies that appear at the bottom of each table were not regarded as the least useful overall, as only those tools and strategies that were rated as being "useful" or "very useful" by at least 50 percent of the teachers who used them for that particular purpose are included in the tables.

Teaching and Learning and Monitoring Progress

Table 38

Rank Order of the Usefulness of the Useful Tools for Providing Information for Teaching and Learning

Year 5	Year 7	Year 9
Observation (3.7)	Observation (3.7)	Observation (3.5)
Teacher written tests (3.7)	Teacher written tests (3.6)	Teacher written tests (3.4)
Topic- and Strand-based Tests (3.6)	Conferencing or interviews (3.5)	Assignments or homework (3.4)
Conferencing or interviews (3.5)	Assessment Resource Banks (3.3)	School developed tests (3.4)
School developed tests (3.4)	School developed tests (3.3)	Exams (3.3)
Checklists or rating scales (3.1)	Topic- and Strand-based Tests (3.3)	Checklists or rating scales (3.2)
Portfolios or work samples (3.1)	Checklists or rating scales (3.1)	Assessment Resource Banks (3.2)
Assessment Resource Banks (3.1)	Student self assessment (3.0)	Portfolios or work samples (3.2)
Student self assessment (3.0)	Assignments or homework (3.0)	Exemplars (3.1)
Assignments or homework (3.0)	Portfolios or work samples (2.8)	Conferencing or interviews (2.9)
National Educational Monitoring Project tasks (3.0)	National Educational Monitoring Project tasks (2.8)	Peer assessment (2.9)
Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics (2.9)	Peer assessment (2.7)	Student self assessment (2.8)
Peer assessment (2.8)	Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics (2.7)	Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics (2.7)
	Competition Tests (2.5)	

Table 39

Rank Order of the Usefulness of the Useful Tools for Providing Information for Monitoring Progress

Year 5	Year 7	Year 9
Observation (3.7)	School developed tests (3.6)	School developed tests (3.5)
Teacher written tests (3.6)	Conferencing or interviews (3.6)	Teacher written tests (3.4)
Topic- and Strand-based Tests (3.6)	Observation (3.5)	Exams (3.4)
Conferencing or interviews (3.5)	Teacher written tests (3.5)	Observation (3.3)
School developed tests (3.4)	Topic- and Strand-based Tests (3.3)	Assignments or homework (3.3)
Checklists or rating scales (3.2)	Checklists or rating scales (3.2)	Peer assessment (3.1)
Portfolios or work samples (3.2)	Assessment Resource Banks (3.1)	Portfolios or work samples (3.1)
Assessment Resource Banks (3.0)	Portfolios or work samples (3.0)	Checklists or rating scales (3.1)
Student self assessment (3.0)	Assignments or homework (2.8)	Conferencing or interviews (3.1)
National Educational Monitoring Project tasks (2.9)	Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics (2.7)	Assessment Resource Banks (3.0)
Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics (2.8)	Student self assessment (2.7)	Student self assessment (2.8)
Assignments or homework (2.8)		Exemplars (2.8)
Peer assessment (2.7)		Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics (2.6)

As with English, almost all the mathematics tools and strategies were rated by more than 50 percent of those who used them as being "useful" or "very useful" for teaching and learning and monitoring progress. Also once again, the one tool consistent by failing to meet this criterion was Competition Tests, indicating that such tests were not seen as particularly useful for teaching and learning and for monitoring progress.

Observation, teacher written tests, and school developed tests were commonly used for these purposes by all year groups, and were rated highly for usefulness as well. They were all rated among the top five most useful tools and strategies.

Topic- and Strand-based Tests, conferencing or interviews, and checklists or rating scales were rated highly for usefulness at Years 5 and 7, whereas assignments and exams were rated highly at Year 9. Although only 18 percent of Year 9 teachers used checklists or rating scales, those who did, rated their usefulness about the same as Year 5 and 7 teachers did.

The Assessment Resource Banks and portfolios or work samples were also consistently rated highly by all three year groups for teaching and learning and monitoring progress.

For the purposes of teaching and learning and monitoring progress, it would appear that not only were teacher or school developed tools and strategies the most frequently used, but they were also the most useful. Assessment Resource Banks and Topic- and Strand-based Tests were the only externally developed tools to appear in the top eight rated tools. However, although the Assessment Resource Banks themselves are externally developed, the creation of an assessment from them is done by a teacher. This ability to tailor them to the needs of the class, as with the other teacher or school developed tools, appears to have raised the level of usefulness of this tool for teaching and learning and for monitoring progress.

Students and Parents or Caregivers

Table 40

Rank Order of the Usefulness of the Useful Tools for Providing Information for Students

Year 5	Year 7	Year 9
Conferencing or interviews (3.5)	Conferencing or interviews (3.4)	School developed tests (3.4)
Student self assessment (3.4)	Teacher written tests (3.4)	Exams (3.3)
Observation (3.3)	Student self assessment (3.3)	Teacher written tests (3.3)
Teacher written tests (3.3)	Observation (3.2)	Assignments or homework (3.2)
Portfolios or work samples (3.2)	School developed tests (3.2)	Exemplars (3.2)
Topic- and Strand-based Tests (3.1)	Peer assessment (3.2)	Observation (3.2)
Peer assessment (3.1)	Assignments or homework (3.0)	Checklists or rating scales (3.2)
School developed tests (3.0)	Portfolios or work samples (3.0)	Conferencing or interviews (3.1)
Assignments or homework (3.0)	Topic- and Strand-based Tests (2.9)	Portfolios or work samples (3.0)
National Educational Monitoring Project tasks (2.9)	Assessment Resource Banks (2.7)	Assessment Resource Banks (3.0)
Assessment Resource Banks (2.7)	Competition Tests (2.6)	Student self assessment (2.9)
Checklists or rating scales (2.7)	Checklists or rating scales (2.6)	Peer assessment (2.7)
Competition Tests (2.6)		

Table 41

Rank Order of the Usefulness of the Useful Tools for Providing Information for Parents or Caregivers

Year 5	Year 7	Year 9
Portfolios or work samples (3.4)	Portfolios or work samples (3.4)	Exams (3.5)
Teacher written tests (3.1)	School developed tests (3.1)	School developed tests (3.3)
Topic- and Strand-based Tests (3.0)	Assignments or homework (3.0)	Teacher written tests (3.2)
Assignments or homework (3.0)	Teacher written tests (3.0)	Checklists or rating scales (3.1)
Conferencing or interviews (3.0)	Topic- and Strand-based Tests (2.9)	Assignments or homework (3.1)
Observation (3.0)	Conferencing or interviews (2.8)	Conferencing or interviews (3.0)
School developed tests (2.9)	Observation (2.7)	Observation (2.9)
Student self assessment (2.9)	Student self assessment (2.6)	Portfolios or work samples (2.9)
Checklists or rating scales (2.8)	Assessment Resource Banks (2.6)	Peer assessment (2.8)
Competition Tests (2.7)	Competition Tests (2.6)	Competition Tests (2.6)
National Educational Monitoring Project tasks (2.6)		Exemplars (2.4)
Assessment Resource Banks (2.6)		

Most of the tools and strategies were rated as "useful" or "very useful" by more than 50 percent of those who use them for providing information for students, parents or caregivers. Teacher written tests stand out as one tool that was consistently rated highly across all three years, and was frequently used by all.

While the four top rated tools and strategies for providing information to students were the same for Years 5 and 7, teacher written tests was the only tool to appear at all three years. Few of the most useful tools and strategies at Years 5 and 7 were a "test" style of assessment, whereas at Year 9, those most highly rated tended to be so, i.e., exams and school or teacher developed tests. It would seem that by Year 9, the tools and strategies seen as most useful for this purpose have shifted from those that provide more informal feedback to those of a more quantitative nature.

Although observation was used by fewer teachers at Year 9 for providing information to students, those who did use it rated its usefulness as highly as the Year 5 and 7 teachers did.

Assignments or homework were frequently used for these purposes across all years, and were also rated similarly and highly by all. At Years 5 and 7, portfolios or work samples were the most frequently used tool for providing information to parents or caregivers, and were also rated as the most useful. At Year 9, exams were used and rated similarly highly.

At Years 5 and 7, although both Competition Tests and the Progressive Achievement Test were frequently used for providing information to parents or caregivers, neither were seen as particularly useful. The Progressive Achievement Tests were not designed for purposes of reporting to parents, so it follows that they would not be perceived as being useful for this purpose, and perhaps should not be used this way. The most useful tools and strategies for the purposes of providing information to students and to parents or caregivers continue to be teacher or school developed.

Next Year's Teacher, School Management, and External Agencies

Table 42

Rank Order of the Usefulness of the Useful Tools for Providing Information for Next Year's Teacher

Year 5	Year 7	Year 9
School developed tests (3.0)	School developed tests (3.0)	Observation (3.4)
Topic- and Strand-based Tests (2.9)	Portfolios or work samples (2.9)	Portfolios or work samples (3.4)
Portfolios or work samples (2.8)	Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics (2.7)	Exams (3.2)
Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics (2.8)	Topic- and Strand-based Tests (2.6)	School developed tests (3.0)
Assessment Resource Banks (2.8)	Checklists or rating scales (2.6)	Assessment Resource Banks (2.9)
Teacher written tests (2.6)	Assessment Resource Banks (2.5)	Checklists or rating scales (2.7)
Checklists or rating scales (2.5)		Teacher written tests (2.7)
Observation (2.5)		Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics (2.7)
National Educational Monitoring Project tasks (2.1)		Conferencing (2.6)
		Competition Tests (2.5)
		Assignments or homework (2.5)
		Student self assessment (2.5)
		Exemplars (2.4)
		Peer assessment (2.3)

Table 43

Rank Order of the Usefulness of the Useful Tools for Providing Information for School Management

Year 5	Year 7	Year 9
School developed tests (3.0)	Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics (2.8)	Exams (3.3)
National Educational Monitoring Project tasks (2.9)	Portfolios or work samples (2.8)	School developed tests (3.0)
Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics (2.9)	School developed tests (2.7)	Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics (2.7)
Topic- and Strand-based Tests (2.8)	National Educational Monitoring Project tasks (2.7)	Portfolios or work samples (2.6)
Portfolios or work samples (2.8)	Topic- and Strand-based Tests (2.6)	Peer assessment (2.4)
Assessment Resource Banks (2.7)	Assessment Resource Banks (2.6)	Student self assessment (2.3)
	Teacher written tests (2.5)	Conferencing or interviews (2.2)

Table 44

Rank Order of the Usefulness of the Tools for Providing Information for External Agencies

Year 5	Year 7	Year 9
Topic- and Strand-based Tests (2.9)	Assessment Resource Banks (2.8)	Exams (2.9)
Portfolios or work samples (2.9)	Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics (2.7)	Assessment Resource Banks (2.7)
Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics (2.8)	National Educational Monitoring Project tasks (2.7)	Peer assessment (2.7)
School developed tests (2.7)	Portfolios or work samples (2.6)	Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics (2.6)
Assessment Resource Banks (2.7)	Checklists or rating scales (2.6)	Portfolios or work samples (2.5)
Student self assessment (2.3)	Topic- and Strand-based Tests (2.4)	Exemplars (2.0)
		Student self assessment (2.0)

Fewer tools and strategies met the criteria of 50 percent of the users finding them "useful" or "very useful" for providing information to next year's teachers, school management, and external agencies than for the previous purposes. The only tools and strategies commonly perceived as useful across all three years for these purposes were portfolios or work samples and the Progressive Achievement Test. School developed tests, the Assessment Resource Banks, and checklists or rating scales were commonly seen as useful for providing information to next year's teachers, school developed tests were see this way for school management, and the Assessment Resource Banks were seen this way for providing information to external agencies.

The Assessment Resource Banks and Topic- and Strand-based Tests appeared useful for all three purposes at Years 5 and 7, as did exams, peer assessment, and student self assessment at Year 9.

More tools and strategies were rated as being "useful" or "very useful" by more than 50 percent of those who used them for providing information to next year's teacher by Year 9 teachers than by Year 5 and 7 teachers. The teacher or school developed tools and strategies that met the criteria for inclusion at Year 9 but not at Years 5 and 7 were conferencing or interviews, assignments or homework, student self assessment and peer assessment.

These findings further support those of Osborn et al., (2000), who found a lack of perceived usefulness of the assessment information passed from previous teachers. His one exception, which was also rated relatively highly in this study, was portfolios.

The purposes of providing information to school management and external agencies had the fewest number of tools and strategies rated "useful" or "very useful" by more than 50 percent of users. Only half of all the tools and strategies reached this rating and at

Years 5 and 7, at least half of these were externally developed. However, the most frequently used tools and strategies for these purposes were also rated as being the most useful.

It is interesting to note the change in the mean values calculated for the tools and strategies in each category. For the purposes of providing information for teaching and learning, monitoring progress, and students, most of the tools and strategies had a mean rating of usefulness above 3,[37] whereas for providing information for next year's teachers, school management, and external agencies, less than half reached a mean rating of three. This means that not only did the number rated as useful decline, but so did the rating of the most useful tools and strategies.

Interestingly, too, although externally developed tools appear to be becoming more useful for these purposes, their ratings often did not change greatly. The apparent increase in their usefulness is therefore more a function of the other tools and strategies becoming *less* useful.

Significant Differences in the Usefulness of the Assessment Tools

Significantly more teachers in decile 1–3 schools than in other schools, rated portfolios or work samples as "very useful" for both teaching and learning[38] and monitoring progress.[39] Significantly fewer teachers in minor urban areas rated teacher written tests[40] as "very useful" for teaching and learning than did teachers in rural areas.

Summary of Usefulness

As with English, more tools and strategics were rated as being "useful" or "very useful" by more than 50 percent of those who used them for the purposes of teaching and learning and for monitoring progress than for any of the other purposes. The majority of the tools and strategies were useful for providing information to students and parents or caregivers, but fewer were useful for providing information to next year's teachers, school management, and external agencies.

Not only did more tools and strategies reach the criteria for usefulness for teaching and learning and for monitoring progress, but their overall ratings were higher. The further from the classroom the information was used, the less useful it appeared to become. The majority of the mean ratings for classroom based uses were above 3, whereas for purposes out of the classroom, only a minority of tools and strategies had a mean rating above 3.

As with English, teacher or school developed tools and strategies were the most highly rated for providing information for teaching and learning, monitoring progress, students, and parents or caregivers, whereas externally developed tools became much more prominent for providing information to next year's teachers, school management, and external agencies.

---

[37] On a scale from one to four.

[38] 42% vs. 18%; $\chi^2 = 6.556$, $p < 0.05$

[39] 42% vs. 18%; $\chi^2 = 7.519$, $p < 0.01$

[40] 44% vs. 82%; $\chi^2 = 6.99$, $p < 0.01$

Summary of Mathematics Tools and Strategies

The most commonly used mathematics assessment tools and strategies were once again teacher or school developed, and a number of tools and strategies appeared to be used by most teachers at least once each term. The most common use of the information gained from assessment was for classroom purposes, and the number of tools and strategies seen as providing useful information was the greatest for these purposes. More externally developed tools were used, and rated as being more useful, for purposes external to the classroom, although their ratings showed a marked decrease.

Overall, the most frequently used tools and strategies for the various purposes were also rated as being useful, although perhaps not as strongly as in English. Of the seven purposes for mathematics assessment surveyed in this study and across all three years, the top rated tool or strategy failed on only four occasions to be among the five most frequently used, and only three times were any of the five most frequently used tools and strategies not rated as useful or very useful by 50 percent or more of those who used each of them.

As also found with English, a number of tools and strategies used less frequently at Year 9, such as checklists or rating scales and observation, were rated highly by those who did use them. This reinforces the finding that a few tools and strategies not utilised by many at some year levels appeared to provide useful information if they were used at that year.

The tools that were rated as being "useful" or "very useful" by 50 percent or more for all seven purposes are listed below.

At Year 5:

- Topic- or Strand-based Tests
- Portfolios or work samples
- School developed tests
- Assessment Resource Banks.

At Year 7:

- Assessment Resource Banks
- Portfolios or work samples
- Topic- or Strand-based Tests.

At Year 9:

- Exams
- Peer assessment
- Portfolios or work samples.

Comparison of English and Mathematics Tool Use and Usefulness

In both English and mathematics, overall use of teacher or school developed tools and strategies was greater than that of externally developed tools. The only externally developed tools to have consistently high levels of use across all years in both curriculum areas were the Progressive Achievement Tests and Competition Tests. However, in both English and mathematics, teachers in decile 1–3 schools used Competition Tests significantly less than other teachers did.

A number of teacher or school developed tools and strategies were used significantly more frequently in either English or mathematics at each year. As the year level increased, more differences were found. At Year 5, exemplars and peer assessment were used significantly more in English, and school developed tools were used more in mathematics. At Year 7, exemplars, peer assessment, and portfolios or work samples were used significantly more in English, and school developed tests and teacher written tests were used more in mathematics. At Year 9, checklists or rating scales, conferencing or interviews, exemplars, observation, peer assessment, portfolios or work samples, and student self assessment were all used significantly more frequently in English than they were in mathematics.

For both English and mathematics, assessment was used most frequently for purposes within the classroom. In English, a mix of teacher or school and externally developed tools and strategies were used for these classroom purposes, whereas in mathematics, more teacher or school developed tools and strategies were used. Less use was made of assessment information for purposes outside the classroom, but when it was used, it came more from externally developed tools.

Overall, the greatest number of tools and strategies that were rated as being "useful" or "very useful" by more than 50 percent of those who used them were for the purposes of teaching and learning and monitoring progress. Fewer tools and strategies, but still the majority, were rated as being "useful" for providing information to students and parents or caregivers, and fewer still for next year's teachers, school management, and external agencies.

Teacher or school developed tools and strategies were the most highly rated in both English and mathematics for the purposes of providing information for teaching and learning, monitoring progress, students, and parents or caregivers. Externally developed, more formal methods of assessment became more prominent for providing information for next year's teachers, school management, and external agencies.

Although in English the ratings of the most useful tools and strategies did not fluctuate greatly across the different purposes, this was not so in mathematics. For mathematics, there was a much more pronounced decrease in the mean rating of usefulness as the recipient of the information became more distant from the classroom.

Broader Classroom Assessment Issues

Assessments Required Which Teachers Would Not Choose to do

Only 16 percent of the teachers indicated that there were tools that they were required to use but would not if given the choice. This proportion was consistent between both mathematics and English.

Table 45 shows the English assessment tools and percentage of teachers who indicated they would not use the test, as a proportion of those who reported that they use the test.

Table 45

Teachers Who Indicated They Would Not Use a Particular English Tool if Given the Choice

Assessment Tool	Year 5 %	Year 7 %	Year 9 %
Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension	8	12	6
Progressive Achievement Test: Reading	7	11	7
School developed tests	-	-	10
Proof Reading Tests of Spelling	9	-	-
Burt Word Reading Test	1	7	-
Reading Prose Inventory	6	2	-
Peters Spelling Checklist	4	4	-
Assessment Resource Banks	-	4	-
Exams	-	-	3
Portfolios or work samples	2	1	-
Schonell Spelling Test	-	2	-
Competition Tests	-	-	2

Thirteen other tools were also mentioned by teachers as ones that they would not use if given the choice. Each of these tools was mentioned by only one or two teachers and had been earlier classified under "other tools".

Table 46 shows the mathematics assessment tools and percentage of teachers who indicated they would not use the test, as a proportion of those who reported that they use the test.

Table 46

Teachers Who Indicated They Would Not Use a Particular Mathematics Tool if Given the Choice

Assessment Tool	Year 5 %	Year 7 %	Year 9 %
Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics	9	10	10
School developed tests	5	6	3
Topic- and Strand-based Tests	-	4	-
Competition Tests	2	-	-

Sixteen other tools were also mentioned by teachers as ones that they would not use if given the choice. Each of these tools was mentioned by only one teacher, and had been earlier classified under "other tools".

In English the most frequently mentioned tool in this category at Year 5 was Proof Reading Tests of Spelling; at Year 7, it was the Progressive Achievement Tests; and at Year 9, it was school developed tests. In mathematics, the Progressive Achievement Test was the most frequently reported at all three years. However, as these proportions were only around 10 percent of those who used the tools, there seemed to be little dissatisfaction with the tools that schools require teachers to use.

The most common reason given for the source of requirement for doing the assessment was that it was on going school policy. This was the reason given for 71 percent of all the tools mentioned by the teachers.

Osborn et al. (2000), found that 79 percent of those interviewed had a positive, mixed, or neutral feeling about the required assessment they did. In the current survey, 84 percent did not indicate any tool that they would prefer not to use, but were required to use. These findings would appear to indicate reasonably similar levels of satisfaction with required assessment in both studies.

Most and Least Frequently Assessed English Functions

Teachers were asked if there was a difference in the amount of assessment they do for the different functions in English. Eighty-even percent of Year 5, 79 percent of Year 7, and 79 percent of Year 9 teachers indicated that there was. Those teachers who gave a positive response were then asked to indicate which functions were the most and least frequently assessed, and why. Tables 47 and 48 show responses.

Table 47

Which English Function is the Most Frequently Assessed?

Function	Year 5 %	Year 7 %	Year 9 %
Listening	3	2	1
Speaking	6	3	4
Reading	68	64	33
Writing	51	56	80
Viewing	2	0	1
Presenting	5	2	3

Note: A number of teachers ticked two strands, hence the percentages do not add to 100.

Year 5 and 7 teachers appeared to be relatively equally divided between reading and writing as being the most frequently assessed English function. At Year 9, writing was the most frequently assessed at 80 percent, followed by reading at 33 percent. These data indicate that the current focus on literacy is being well supported by classroom teachers assessment practices.

Table 48

Main Reasons for a Function Being the Most Frequently Assessed

	Year 5 %	Year 7 %	Year 9 %
High priority for reporting	60	62	40
Has most content to assess	36	34	44
Most important strand	32	34	43
Lots of resources available	20	26	23
Concepts easy to assess	21	18	23
Confident with this strand	9	26	12

The predominant reasons given for a function being the most frequently assessed were that it was a "high priority for reporting" (particularly at Years 5 and 7), had the "most content to assess" (all year levels), and was the "most important strand" (all year levels). Hence, at Years 5 and 7, the responses indicate that reporting requirements are a greater influence on the frequency of assessment than the importance of a strand or the amount of content within a strand. This raises questions about the motivating factors in teachers' assessment decision-making which cannot be addressed by the current research. This issue is worthy of further investigation.

When the reasons given were looked at by the function chosen as being the most frequently assessed, significantly more teachers, at all years, who selected reading as the most frequently assessed function selected "most important strand"[41] as the reason for doing so, whereas of those who selected writing as the most frequently assessed function more selected "has most content to assess"[42] as the reason for doing so. Teachers at Year 5 also indicated a "high priority for reporting"[43] significantly more frequently for reading than for writing.

Therefore for some, reading and writing were more frequently assessed for different reasons. Although reading was perceived by some as being the most important function, writing was seen to have the most content to assess, and therefore it appeared to make greater demands on some teachers' assessment practices.

Tables 49 and 50 show the responses on which English function is the least frequently assessed, and why.

Table 49

Teachers Indicating Which Function is the Least Frequently Assessed?

Strand	Year 5 %	Year 7 %	Year 9 %
Listening	22	22	61
Speaking	10	1	9
Reading	0	1	1
Writing	1	0	0
Viewing	61	70	20
Presenting	7	10	9

Note: A number of teachers ticked two strands, hence the percentages do not add to 100.

---

[41] Year 5 - 67% vs 28%, $x^2=5.070$, Year 7- 44% vs 17%, $x^2=4.262$, $p<0.05$, Year 9 - 91% vs 30%, $x^2=10.553$, $p<0.01$

[42] Year 5 - 61% vs 17%, $x^2=13.806$, Year 7 - 52% vs 17%, $x^2=7.494$, Year 9 - 57% vs 0%, $x^2=9.267$, $p<0.01$

[43] 46% vs 16%, $x^2= 5.0699$ $p<0.05$

At Years 5 and 7, the least frequently assessed function was viewing (61 percent and 70 percent respectively), with listening being identified by 22 percent. At Year 9 this reverses, with listening being the least frequently assessed (61 percent), and viewing being identified by 20 percent.

Table 50

Teachers' Main Reason(s) for a Function Being the Least Frequently Assessed

Reason	Year 5 %	Year 7 %	Year 9 %
Concepts difficult to assess	45	44	32
Low priority for reporting	28	31	31
Lack of resources available	22	38	44
Not confident with this strand	17	24	11
Has least content to assess	15	15	13
Least important strand	8	10	15

The most often cited reasons for a strand being the least assessed were "concepts difficult to assess" (particularly for Years 5 and 7), "lack of resources" (particularly for Years 7 and 9) and "low priority for reporting" (all three year levels).

When the reasons given were looked at by the function chosen, it was found that significantly more Year 9 teachers who selected listening rather than viewing as the least assessed function selected "lack of resources available"[44] as the reason for doing so.

The reasons for the least frequently assessed functions require further research attention. The low frequency of assessment for these functions was clearly not related to perceptions of low importance, but was rather due to difficulties with the actual assessment of the function, such as a lack of resources and of knowledge of how to assess it in a valid and reliable way.

Most and Least Frequently Assessed Mathematics Strands

Seventy-seven percent of Year 5, 56 percent Year 7, and 36 percent Year 9 teachers indicated that there was a difference in the amount of assessment they do for the different mathematics strands. It is interesting to note that as the year level increases, the percentage indicating a difference decreases.

Tables 51 and 52 show which strand was the most frequently assessed, and why.

Table 51

Which Mathematics Strand is the Most Frequently Assessed?

Strand	Year 5 %	Year 7 %	Year 9 %
Number	99	100	49
Measurement	1	0	11
Geometry	1	0	9
Algebra	3	1	37
Statistics	0	0	3

Note: A number of teachers ticked two strands, hence the percentages do not add to 100.

---

[44] 61% vs 15%, $x^2=6.669$, $p<0.01$

Number was identified almost exclusively as the most frequently assessed strand by Years 5 and 7 teachers (99 percent and 100 percent respectively). This is consistent with the value being placed on the number strand in primary classrooms. This dropped to 49 percent at Year 9, with algebra being identified as the most frequently assessed strand by 37 percent of the teachers. However, as only 36 percent of Year 9 teachers felt there was a difference in the amount of assessment done in the different strands, in fact the clear majority view was that no difference exists. Given the broadening of focus at secondary schools, these data would be expected.

Table 52

Teachers' Main Reasons for a Strand Being the Most Frequently Assessed

Reason	Year 5 %	Year 7 %	Year 9 %
Most important strand	89	76	43
High priority for reporting	42	53	6
Has most content to assess	31	41	37
Concepts easy to assess	10	16	23
Lots of resources available	4	7	6
Confident with this strand	4	7	6

The most frequent reason given by teachers of Years 5, 7, and 9 for a strand being the most frequently assessed was that it was the "most important strand". This was given by 89 percent, 76 percent, and 43 percent respectively. As almost all at Years 5 and 7 indicated number as being the most frequently assessed, it can be assumed that the majority of teachers do indeed perceive the assessment of number, to be the most important aspect of mathematics assessment.

For Years 5 and 7, the second most important reason given for choosing strand was that it had a "high priority for reporting". At Year 9, the second most important reason was that it "has the most content to assess". No pattern was found for Year 9 between the strand indicated as being most frequently assessed, and the reason given for this.

Tables 53 and 54 show the teacher responses to which strand was least frequently assessed, and why.

Table 53

Which Strand is the Least Frequently Assessed?

Strand	Year 5 %	Year 7 %	Year 9 %
Algebra	34	26	11
Geometry	9	18	9
Measurement	6	4	14
Number	0	0	0
Statistics	27	28	57

Note: The percentages do not add to 100 percent as not all teachers indicated a least frequently assessed strand.

Table 54

Teachers' Main Reason(s) for a Strand Being the Least Frequently Assessed

Reason	Year 5 %	Year 7 %	Year 9 %
Has least content to assess	30	25	31
Low priority for reporting	21	24	9
Concepts difficult to assess	10	19	11
Least important strand	9	7	9
Lack of resources available	6	7	3
Not confident with this strand	3	4	9

At Years 5 and 7, there was a split between algebra and statistics as the least frequently assessed strands, whereas at Year 9, it was clearly statistics. Number was not mentioned at any year level as being the least frequently assessed strand, and geometry (except Year 7) and measurement (except Year 9) were also not often mentioned as being the least frequently assessed strand. However, it is also important to note that almost as many teachers responded that there was no least frequently assessed strand, that is, all strands other than number were assessed equally.

When asked why a strand was the least frequently assessed, the most frequent reason given by all three year groups was "has least content to assess". Being a "low priority for reporting" was the next most common reason given by Years 5 and 7. The reasons "least important strand", "not confident with this strand", and "lack of resources available" were not mentioned by more than 9 percent of any year group.

A small number of other reasons were given for a strand being least frequently assessed. Of these, the only theme to emerge was related to running out of time to assess it.

No correlation was found between the particular strand nominated as the least assessed, and any of the six specific reasons, at any year level.

Combined responses from English and mathematics

A number of questions related to assessment generally, and not specifically to English or mathematics. As there were few differences in the responses from those completing each of the questionanires, responses have been combined and analysed as one data set.

Most and Least Frequently Assessed Curriculum Areas

Year 5 and 7 teachers who take their students for all curriculum areas were asked if there was a difference in the amount of assessment they do for the different areas. A clear majority, 82 percent of Year 5 and 72 percent of Year 7 teachers, responded that there was. (Year 9 teachers were not asked to respond to this question, as they do not usually take students for all curriculum areas.) Those who responded positively were then asked to identify the most and least frequently assessed curriculum areas, and the reasons for this.

Table 55 shows the curriculum area that teachers felt they assessed the most, and Table 56 shows their reported reasons.

Table 55

Teachers' Identification of the Most Frequently Assessed Curriculum Area

Curriculum Area	Year 5 %	Year 7 %
English	57	59
Health and Physical Education	3	4
Mathematics	63	59
Science	2	4
Social Studies	1	4
The Arts	1	1
Technology	0	0

Note: A number of teachers ticked two curriculum areas, hence the percentages do not add to 100.

Both English and mathematics were almost equally identified as being the most assessed curriculum area, at both Year 5 and Year 7. Few teachers selected any of the other curriculum areas.

Table 56

Reasons Given for Assessing the Curriculum Area Identified the Most Frequently

Reason	Year 5 %	Year 7 %
High priority for reporting	58	58
Has most content to assess	45	46
Most important area	38	38
Concepts easy to assess	21	33
Lots of resources available	12	16
Confident with this area	10	19

When teachers were asked to identify their reasons, just over half the teachers responded that they chose that area as being the most frequently assessed because it was a "high priority for reporting". Just under half responded that it had the "most content to assess". Over a third, 38 percent, of the teachers identified that area as being the "most important". A small number of teachers gave other reasons, but no clear pattern emerged from their responses.

However, when the reasons given were linked back to the curriculum area chosen as being the most frequently assessed, the reasons "high priority for reporting"[45] and "most important area"[46] were chosen significantly more frequently for English, whereas "concepts easy to assess"[47] was chosen significantly more frequently for mathematics.

---

[45] 71% vs. 42%; $\chi^2 = 22.614$, $p<0.01$

[46] 51% vs. 18%; $\chi^2 = 36.977$, $p<0.01$

[47] 47% vs. 11%; $\chi^2 = 44.357$, $p<0.01$

As only a small number of teachers responded to this question for curriculum areas other than English or mathematics, it can be assumed that these reasons reflect how a majority of teachers perceive the assessment of English and mathematics.

The curriculum area that teachers felt they assessed the least, and their reasons, are shown in Tables 57 and 58.

Table 57

Teachers' Identification of the Least Frequently Assessed Curriculum Area

Curriculum Area	Year 5 %	Year 7 %
English	1	1
Health and Physical Education	15	20
Mathematics	0	0
Science	5	6
Social Studies	7	4
The Arts	50	60
Technology	31	15

Note: A number of teachers ticked two curriculum areas, hence the percentages do not add to 100.

The arts was identified by over half the teachers as being the least frequently assessed curriculum area. Although 31 percent of Year 5 teachers identified technology as being the least assessed area, this dropped to 15 percent at Year 7. The second most frequently reported area at Year 9 was health and physical education, at 20 percent.

An interesting change happened between the years for the second most frequently identified strand. Although almost one in three Year 5 teachers identified technology as being the least assessed area, this dropped by a half to one in six at Year 7. This could be in part affected by the number of students who go to specialist technology classes at Year 7. As the students are often out of the classroom for technology at Year 7, the classroom teacher receives the assessment information without having to do it, whereas at Year 5, the classroom teacher has to do the assessment.

Table 58

Reasons Given for Assessing the Identified Curriculum Area the Least Frequently

Reason	Year 5 %	Year 7 %
Concepts difficult to assess	34	37
Low priority for reporting	31	38
Not confident with this area	18	18
Lack of resources available	16	22
Has least content to assess	15	14
Least important area	10	12

The two most commonly reported reasons for the curriculum area chosen being the least frequently assessed were that the "concepts were difficult to assess" and the area had a "low priority for reporting". It is also worthy noting, however, that nearly one fifth of the teachers were "not confident with this area". Only 11 percent of the teachers overall deemed the area to be the "least important area". A small number of teachers offered alternative reasons, but once again, no clear pattern emerged.

As over 50 percent of teachers responded that the concepts were difficult to assess or that they were not confident with the area, it would appear to indicate a need for more professional development, in particular in the arts. Little difference was found when the reasons given were linked back to the curriculum area chosen.

Changes In, and Satisfaction With, Assessment

Year 5 and 7 teachers were asked to rate, on a 5-point scale, how much assessment they are doing for each curriculum area now compared with three years ago. Year 9 teachers were asked only about the curriculum area they were completing the questionnaire for, as they typically do not teach all curriculum areas. The scale went from 1, " a lot less" to 5, "a lot more". The mean ratings are shown in Table 59.

Table 59

Teachers' Mean Rating of How Much Assessment is Done Now, Compared With 3 Years Ago

Curriculum Area	Year 5	Year 7	Year 9
English	3.82	3.88	3.61
Mathematics	3.71	3.83	3.61
Technology	3.49	3.53	-
Health and Physical Education	3.40	3.54	-
The Arts	3.39	3.61	-
Social Studies	3.32	3.47	-
Science	3.29	3.42	-

Ratings for English and mathematics, at all year levels, were skewed away from the mid-point of the scale ("about the same") towards the upper range of the scale, i.e., more assessment is being done now than three years ago. At Year 7 only, technology, the arts, and health and physical education were also slightly skewed towards the upper side of the scale, but not as much as English and mathematics.

As English and mathematics had the highest mean ratings, this appeared to indicate that teachers considered that these two curriculum areas had had the greatest increase in assessment over the past three years.

When these results are compared with Wylie's (1999) findings in response to the same question, it would appear that the pace of increasing assessment appears to have lessened — 90 percent of her respondents stated that the amount of assessment had increased over the preceding three years (1996-1998).

Year 5 and 7 teachers were also asked to rate, on another 5-point scale, the amount of assessment they are currently doing in each curriculum area. Once again, Year 9 teachers responded for only English or mathematics. The scale went from 1, "too little", to 5, "too much". Across all year levels, and all curriculum areas, at least 49 percent of the teachers responded with a rating of 3, "about right". The mean ratings are shown in Table 60.

Table 60

Teachers' Mean Rating of the Amount of Assessment They Are Doing Now

Curriculum Area	Year 5	Year 7	Year 9
Mathematics	3.30	3.37	3.28
English	3.29	3.27	3.63
Social Studies	3.14	3.22	-
Health and Physical Education	3.05	3.15	-
Science	3.04	3.10	-
Technology	2.99	3.20	-
The Arts	2.96	3.11	-

All the mean ratings also clustered around 3, "about right", with teachers of Year 9 English being the only area to have a mean rating skewed slightly towards the upper range of the scale.

It would appear that although teachers reported that they were doing more assessment in English and mathematics than they were three years ago, the current amount of assessment was perceived by just over half of the teachers as being about right.

Sources of Feedback and Information

Teachers were asked to select from a list those people who gave them feedback about their students' assessment results. Their responses are shown in Table 61.

Table 61

People Who Give Teachers Feedback About Their Students' Assessment Results

Feedback received from:	Year 5 %	Year 7 %	Year 9 %
Principal/Deputy Principal/Assistant Principal	62	54	15
Curriculum or Syndicate Leader/Head of Department	48	53	61
Other Teacher(s)	52	56	61
Board of Trustees	13	20	7
Parent or Caregiver	73	67	75
Students	76	78	83

For around three-quarters of the teachers, at all years, the most commonly reported sources of feedback were students and parents or caregivers. Other teacher(s) and the curriculum or syndicate leader/head of department were slightly less commonly reported at all year levels, but still selected by around half of the teachers. At Years 5 and 7, the principal/deputy principal/assistant principal also featured strongly. At all years the fewest number of teachers reported receiving feedback from the board of trustees.

For the second part of the question, teachers were asked to rate on a 4-point scale how useful they found the feedback from the various sources. Their responses are shown in Table 62.

Table 62

How Useful Teachers Found the Feedback to be

Feedback received from:	Usefulness of feedback	Year 5 %	Year 7 %	Year 9 %
Principal/Deputy Principal/Assistant Principal	Of little or no use	3	6	6
	Of some use	26	29	67
	Useful	50	57	25
	Very useful	21	9	3
Curriculum or Syndicate Leader/Head of Department	Of little or no use	2	4	0
	Of some use	19	30	14
	Useful	51	46	53
	Very useful	29	22	33
Other Teacher(s)	Of little or no use	2	2	1
	Of some use	27	24	27
	Useful	49	55	45
	Very useful	23	21	27
Board of Trustees	Of little or no use	22	26	50
	Of some use	37	34	36
	Useful	31	38	15
	Very useful	10	0	0
Parent or Caregiver	Of little or no use	6	5	6
	Of some use	36	35	43
	Useful	41	44	33
	Very useful	19	16	18
Students	Of little or no use	2	3	2
	Of some use	22	22	24
	Useful	42	41	45
	Very useful	34	35	30

Teachers appeared to receive useful feedback from a range of sources, including students, parents, other teachers, and senior and middle management. The only exception to this was from senior management at Year 9.

The board of trustees was the only other source from which little feedback was received, and what was received was of limited use.

Teachers were also asked whom they go to when they need to understand an assessment issue better. Their responses are shown in Table 63.

Table 63

Teachers' Sources of Assessment Information

Source of Information	Year 5 %	Year 7 %	Year 9 %
Other Teachers/Other Senior Staff	81	86	84
Principal/Deputy Principal/Assistant Principal	62	59	19
Head of Department/Syndicate or Curriculum Leader	54	57	79
Books/Other Publications	54	55	44
Short Courses/Seminars/Workshops	40	41	33
Internet	31	43	30
Advisors	28	37	21
New Zealand Council for Educational Research	11	15	7
"Assessment for Better Learning" Facilitators	9	9	3
Education Review Office	1	2	3

It would appear that teachers consult widely on issues of assessment. Other teachers were the most common source of information at all year levels with over 80 percent of teachers identifying them as such. At Years 5 and 7, 61 percent identified senior management as a source of information compared with only 19 percent at Year 9. Beside other teachers, the other most common source of information at Year 9 was the head of department, at 79 percent.

Half the teachers utilised books and other publications as sources of assessment information, just over one third identified short courses, seminars, or workshops, and just over one third identified the internet as being sources that they utilised. Just under one third identified advisors as another source of assessment information.

Half of all the teachers reported that they utilised at least one type of external professional development initiative, that is advisors, Assessment for Better Learning facilitators, or short courses/seminars/workshops. This response was relatively equal across all three year groups.

A number of other sources were also cited by teachers. The most common of these were curriculum documents, reported by 11 teachers, and the Te Kete Ipurangi—The Online Learning Centre website, reported by 5 teachers. However, these data probably do not reflect actual usage as others that utilise these sources may have used the classifications given to indicate their usage, e.g., other teachers may have indicated their use of the Te Kete Ipurangi website by ticking that they use the internet.

When teachers were asked to put in rank order the two main sources that they go to for assessment information, both Years 5 and 7 identified other teachers as their first source, and their syndicate or curriculum leader as their second. At Year 9, the head of department was identified as being the first source of information, with other teachers being the second.

Not only were other teachers and senior and middle management sources of feedback, they also appeared to be common sources of information. There is obviously a large amount of cross-fertilisation that occurs within a school between various levels of management and colleagues. Once again, however, Year 9 teachers did not report receiving information from senior management. Within the secondary sector, the head of department takes on much more of this role, whereas in the primary sector, this role appears to be more common to those in both senior and middle management.

Inconsistencies Between School Policy and Classroom Practice

Tables 64 and 65 show the percentages of teachers who believe there is an inconsistency between their school's assessment policy and their classroom practices, and what the inconsistency is.

Table 64

Teachers Reporting an Inconsistency Between School Policy and Classroom Practice

Year 5 %	Year 7 %	Year 9 %
13	16	9

Table 65

Teachers' Reasons for the Inconsistency Between Policy and Practice

Reason	Year 5 %	Year 7 %	Year 9 %
Policy and classroom utilise different styles	58	41	65
Issues to do with the data that is collected	36	14	29
Policy requires too much workload	11	16	24
Policy too old/needs updating	11	11	0
Policy too global/unclear	5	14	0
Policy too specific	5	3	0

Overall, only 13 percent of teachers reported an inconsistency between their school's policy and their classroom practice. The most common issue was that the policy and the classroom utilised different styles of assessment (55 percent). The second most common issue was to do with the data that is collected, such as how it is used, and its validity (26 percent).

Desired New Tools

Teachers were asked to indicate if they would like new assessment tools to be developed, and what those tools should be. Just over half the teachers (54 percent) indicated that they would like to see new assessment tools developed for New Zealand classrooms. Table 66 shows the tools that teachers would like developed.

Table 66

Tools Identified to be Developed

Type of Assessment Tool	Year 5 %	Year 7 %	Year 9 %
Strand or objective specific	31	22	38
Nationally defined or standardised	21	26	10
Simplified or less time consuming	18	22	6
Exemplars or benchmarks	19	15	3
Curriculum level specific	11	12	8
Wider range of assessments	11	9	23
Extend or update current tools	10	10	6
Tools that support the National Certificate of Educational Achievement	0	0	16

Between one third and one fifth of the Year 5 and 7 teachers who wanted more tools identified strand and objective specific assessments, standardised assessments, less time consuming assessments, and exemplars and benchmarks as being those most desired.

Thirty-eight percent of the Year 9 teachers who wanted more tools also identified strand and objective specific assessments, but a quarter also expressed a desire for a wider range of assessments (such as checklists, self-assessments, extension, practical, and assessments in Maori), and 16 percent expressed a desire for tools that support the National Certificate of Educational Achievement.

A number of other suggestions were made; of these, the most common theme was tools that utilise technology more.

General Comments

Teachers were also given the opportunity to make any other comments about their assessment practices that had not been covered by the questionnaire. Few (less than 25 percent), chose to do so but of those who did, the most common comments were related to the demands and pressures felt in the classroom, and how assessment exacerbates this, or a comment on their own assessment practices.

4 CONCLUSIONS

At the outset, three research questions were posed. These can now be commented on in light of the findings discussed in this report.

1. What assessments are being used in the areas of English and mathematics at Years 5, 7, and 9?

A variety of assessment tools and strategies were being used regularly by teachers of English and mathematics at all years. The tools and strategies that were being used by at least half of those teachers surveyed in both English and mathematics at Year 5 were:

- Assignments or homework;
- Burt Word Reading Test;
- Checklists or rating scales;
- Competition Tests (mathematics only);
- Conferencing or interviews;
- Observation;
- Peer assessment;
- Portfolios or work samples;
- Progressive Achievement Tests;
- School developed tests (mathematics only);
- Student self assessment;
- Teacher written tests;
- Topic- and Strand-based Tests.

Tools and strategies used by more than 50 percent of Year 7 teachers in English and mathematics were:

- Assignments or homework;
- Burt Word Reading Test;
- Checklists or rating scales;
- Competition Tests;
- Conferencing or interviews;
- Observation;
- Peer assessment;
- Portfolios or work samples;
- Progressive Achievement Tests;
- School developed tests;
- Student self assessment;
- Teacher written tests.

Tools and strategies used by more than 50 percent of Year 9 teachers in English and mathematics were:

- Assignments or homework;
- Competition Tests;
- Conferencing or interviews (English only);
- Exam exemplars (English only);
- Observation;
- Peer assessment (English only);
- Portfolios or work samples (English only);
- Progressive Achievement Tests;
- School developed tests;
- Student self assessment (English only);
- Teacher written tests (mathematics only).

Most of the assessment tools and strategies used at all years were teacher or school developed rather than externally developed. Competition Tests and the Progressive Achievement Tests were the only externally developed tools that were used consistently by many teachers.

A raw score/percent was the most commonly recorded information from the externally developed tools in both English and mathematics. In English, a written comment was frequently recorded for teacher or school developed tools and strategies. In mathematics, there was much more variety in the information teachers commonly recorded. Black, Harrison, Lee, Marshall, and Wiliam (2002) argue that marks by themselves are of very limited use as feedback for student learning. Data from the current study would seem to indicate that on many occasions, teachers also record written comments. This was more so in English. However, a direct relationship between the type of data most often recorded and the type of feedback most often given cannot be assumed.

The frequency of use of each tool and strategy was consistent with expectations—that is, formal, standardised tests, such as the Progressive Achievement Test were used once a year, whereas observation was commonly used daily. Many of the tools and strategies were commonly used 2–5 times a year, indicating that assessment in both English and mathematics is a regular feature of New Zealand classrooms.

Teachers at Years 5 and 7 were divided between English and mathematics as being the most frequently assessed curriculum area. When the reported use of the various tools and strategies was compared with these responses, it was clear that both English and mathematics were subject to both a variety and a quantity of assessment at Years 5 and 7. Teachers at Year 9 could not be asked to compare assessment of curriculum areas, as they do not typically teach all areas.

Teachers at all three year levels responded to questions relating to the most and least frequently assessed functions and strands. In English, the reading and writing functions showed similarly high levels of assessment at Years 5 and 7, whereas writing was predominant at Year 9. The least frequently assessed functions were viewing, at Years 5 and 7, and listening at Year 9. In mathematics, number was almost exclusively the most assessed strand in Years 5 and 7, whereas number and (to a lesser extent) algebra were predominant at Year 9. The least frequently assessed strands were algebra and statistics at Years 5 and 7, and statistics at Year 9.

At Year 9, teachers indicated that a greater variety of tools and strategies were being used in English than in mathematics. This however, is not necessarily indicative of a difference in the amount of time spent on assessment in mathematics at Year 9.

The variety of tools and strategies used by teachers may also be reinforced through teachers' responses to the question of how much assessment they are doing. Teachers responded that they were doing more assessment in English and mathematics now than they were three years ago. Interestingly, however, with the exception of Year 9 English, over half the teachers responded that the amount of assessment they were doing now was "about right".

The *New Zealand Curriculum Framework* (Ministry of Education, 1993), states that ". . . a range of assessment procedures is required" (p. 24). These data would appear to indicate that this is indeed the practice of teachers. Those methodologies described in *Assessment: Policy to Practice* (Ministry of Education, 1994), (observation, self-assessment by students, peer assessment, conferencing, portfolios, and tests) were all being well utilised by teachers across Years 5, 7, and 9. The only assessment procedure in this publication which was not utilised by most teachers in this survey in either English or mathematics was exemplars. However, the current initiative of national exemplars will soon add to the resources available to teachers.

2. Why are the assessments undertaken?

The most frequent use of the assessment information by far was for purposes within the classroom, that is, for providing information for teaching and learning, monitoring progress, and students. Almost all the assessment tools and strategies used by teachers were commonly used for these purposes. The further from the classroom the assessment information was used for and the less impact it had on the learning process for the student, the less use of it was made. Fewer tools and strategies were commonly used, and their rates of use also became lower. Those tools used more commonly for purposes outside the classroom also tended to be externally developed.

The *New Zealand Curriculum Framework* states that "Its [assessment] purpose is to improve teaching and learning by diagnosing learning strengths and weaknesses, measuring students' progress against the defined achievement objectives, and reviewing the effectiveness of teaching programmes" (p. 24). This survey reinforces this focus of assessment being evident in teachers' practice.

The high reported frequencies of use of the various tools and strategies for providing information to students also reinforce that teachers find the "communication between student and teacher an essential component of the learning process" (Assessment: Policy to Practice, p. 37). This indicates that there is a strong perceived culture of formative assessment at the classroom level.

This is further reinforced by the finding that 80 percent of the teachers responded that they received feedback about assessment results from students. Other sources of feedback commonly reported were senior management (except at Year 9), middle management, other teachers, and parents or caregivers. All of these were also rated as being useful, in terms of the quality of the feedback received. The exception across all three year levels was the board of trustees. Teachers reported that they received little in the way of feedback from the board, and for those who did, it was reported as being of limited use.

Another reason that a teacher may administer a particular assessment is because of a requirement from such sources as a school policy, or syndicate or department decision. Sixteen percent of the teachers indicated that there were tools which they were required to use, but would prefer not to. Recommendations in *Assessment: Policy to Practice* suggest that staff should be fully involved in the development of the school's assessment policy to ensure a commitment to its implementation. The low levels of dissatisfaction with required assessments would seem to indicate that this was the case in the majority of the schools surveyed. Where teachers are using tools that they would prefer not to use, assuming the school has such a cycle in place, those concerns should be able to be addressed during the review cycle process. However, pedagogical differences may always result in some teachers preferring not to use some tools.

3. Which assessments are the most useful?

Teachers were asked to rate the usefulness of the tools and strategies they use for each of the seven given purposes. These were to provide information for: teaching and learning, monitoring progress, students, parents or caregivers, next year's teacher, school management, and external agencies.

In both English and mathematics, more tools and strategies were rated as being "useful" or "very useful" by more than 50 percent of those who used them for teaching and learning and for monitoring progress than for any of the other purposes. The only tool that did not achieve this rating was Competition Tests. Although Competition Tests were used by between half and three-quarters of the teachers surveyed, it would appear they did not do so for classroom purposes.

The majority of the tools and strategies that were rated highly for these purposes were teacher or school developed. Tools and strategies that were consistently rated highly included observation, teacher written tests, conferencing or interviews, checklists or rating scales, and school developed tests.

Most of the tools and strategies continued to be rated "useful" or "very useful" by the majority of those who used them for providing information to students and to parents or caregivers. Those tools consistently rating the highest were also teacher or school developed.

As the recipient of the information became more distant from the classroom, there was a shift from teacher or school developed tools and strategies to externally developed tools. There was also a marked decrease in the number of tools and strategies which were rated as "useful" or "very useful" by the majority of teacher who used them. The need for a quantitative assessment which gives a score appears to be of greater value for these external purposes; those teacher or school developed tools and strategies which were rated highly for their usefulness were often "tests" rather than more informal strategies of assessment. This aligns them more closely to the format of most of the externally developed tools, such as the Progressive Achievement Tests.

Another consideration to be noted is the under-developed potential of externally developed tools being used for providing information for formative purposes within the classroom. Although guidelines are often available in published manuals, this may require more emphasis in professional development.

Only a handful of tools and strategies were rated as being "useful" or "very useful" by the majority for all seven purposes. These are listed below.

At Year 5:

- Assessment Resource Banks (mathematics only);
- Peters Spelling Checklist;
- Portfolios or work samples;
- Proof Reading Tests of Spelling;
- Reading Prose Inventory;
- Schonell Spelling Test;
- School developed tests;
- Topic- or Strand-based Tests.

At Year 7:

- Assessment Resource Banks (mathematics only);
- Exemplars (English only);
- Peters Spelling Checklist;
- Portfolios or work samples;
- Reading Prose Inventory;
- School developed tests (English only);
- Teacher developed tests (English only);
- Topic- or Strand-based Tests.

At Year 9:

- Exams;
- Peer assessment (mathematics only);
- Portfolios or work samples;
- School developed tests (English only).

There was a high degree of similarity between Years 5 and 7, but a considerable reduction in the number of tools and strategies which met the criteria of usefulness for all purposes at Year 9.

As the development of a new assessment tool requires considerable investment, ensuring that teacher expectations are being met is vital. When asked directly, teachers said they would like to have more strand—or objective—specific, nationally defined, and less time-consuming tools. Teachers of Year 9 students would also like a wider range of assessments to be developed.

Teachers' responses when asked about the least frequently assessed curriculum areas and strands are also indicative of teacher need. The arts was identified by over half of Year 5 and 7 teachers as being the least frequently assessed curriculum area; reasons given indicate the need for more resources and more professional development. These same reasons applied to teachers' responses on the least frequently assessed English function, namely viewing at Years 5 and 7, and listening at Year 9.

Teacher Practice in Relation to the "Formative Ideal"

There is evidently a value placed on formative assessment in New Zealand classrooms, as indicated by the strong emphasis on such strategies as conferencing, observation, and portfolios. This study provides indications that some of the key weaknesses in formative practice identified by Black and Wiliam (1998) may not be applicable to New Zealand teachers' current practice. However, further evidence beyond self report questionnaires is required for a thorough comparison.

The second phase of this study is documenting the assessment practices of 9 schools that have been identified as having good assessment practices. This will help give a better understanding of how some of the practices described in this report are incorporated into the classroom and influence pedagogy. It is likely that it will also be able to shed more light on the relative efficacy of the practices of New Zealand teachers, in relation to Black and Wiliam's four identified weaknesses in practice.

Some appealing and potentially fruitful areas for future research suggested by this phase of the study include:

- a re-examination of the foci of this study in the near future, to explore changes to this base-line portrayal of teacher practice, given that the Ministry initiatives noted at the outset will presumably influence teacher practices and perceptions;
- a more focused examination of the nature and use of some of the informal tools, for example, observation, conferencing, portfolios/work samples;
- an examination of students' experience of assessment process;
- an exploration of the role that boards of trustees play, or might play, in further enhancing the effectiveness of school assessment.

5 REFERENCES

Assessment Tools Cited

Booker, G. (1994). *Booker profiles in mathematics*. Melbourne, Australia: Australian Council for Educational Research.

Croft, A.C., Gilmore, A., Reid, N., Jackson, P. (1981). *Proof-reading tests of spelling*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Educational Assessment Research Unit. *National Educational Monitoring Project tasks*. Dunedin: University of Otago.

Elley, W.B. (2000). *Supplementary test of achievement in reading*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Gilmore, A., Croft, A.C., & Reid, N. (1981). *Burt word reading test: New Zealand revision*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Ministry of Education. (1994). *Beginning school mathematics*. Wellington: Learning Media.

Mossenson, L., Hill, P., & Masters, G. (1987). *Tests of reading comprehension*. Melbourne, Australia: Australian Council for Educational Research.

Neale, M.D. (1999). *Neale analysis of reading ability* (3rd ed.). Melbourne, Australia: Australian Council for Educational Research.

New Zealand Council for Educational Research. *Assessment resource banks*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Peters, M.L. (1975). *Diagnostic and remedial spelling*. London: MacMillan Education Ltd.

Reid, N.A. (1993). *Progressive achievement test of mathematics*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Reid, N.A., & Elley, W.B. (1991). *Progressive achievement tests of reading*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Reid, N.A., Johnston, I.C., & Elley, W.B. (1994). *Progressive achievement tests of listening comprehension*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Schonell, F.J., & Schonell, F.E. (1950). *Schonell reading tests*. Great Britain: Oliver and Boyd.

Vernon, P.E. (1998). *Graded word spelling test – revised*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Other citations

Bachor, D.G., & Anderson, J.O. (1994). Elementary teachers' assessment practices as observed in the province of British Columbia. *Assessment in Education*, *1*, 63–93.

Black, P., Harrison, C., Lee, C., Marshall, B., & Wiliam, D. (2002). *Working inside the black box: Assessment for learning in the classroom*. London: Kings College.

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education*, *5*, 7–73.

Carr, M., McGee, C., Jones, A., McKinley, E., Bell, B., Barr, H., & Simpson, T. (2000). *The effects of curricula and assessment on pedagogical approaches and on educational outcomes*. Hamilton: University of Waikato.

Croft, A.C., & Reid, N.R. (1991). *How often and for what purposes are NZCER tests used in primary and secondary schools*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Croft, A.C., Strafford, E., & Mapa, L. (2000). *Stocktake/evaluation of existing diagnostic tools in literacy and numeracy in English* . Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Crooks, T.J. (1988). The impact of classroom evaluation practices on students. *Review of Educational Research*, *58*, 438–481.

Dwyer, C.A. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning: Theory and practice. *Assessment in Education*, *5*, 131–137.

Hattie, J., & Gilmore, A. (2000). *Evaluation of assessment resource banks in schools: Final report*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.

Mavrommatis, Y. (1997). Understanding assessment in the classroom: Phases of assessment process – the assessment episode. *Assessment in Education*, *4*, 381–399.

Ministry of Education. (2002). *Departmental forecast report: 2001/2002*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.

Ministry of Education. (1999). *Information for better learning*. Wellington: Learning Media.

Ministry of Education. (1994). *Assessment: Policy to practice*. Wellington: Learning Media.

Ministry of Education. (1993). *The New Zealand Curriculum Framework*. Wellington: Learning Media.

Osborn, M., McNess, E., Broadfoot, P., Pollard, A., & Triggs, P. (2000). *What teachers do: Changing policy and practice in primary education*. London: Continuum.

Peddie, R. (2000). *Evaluation of the assessment for better learning professional development programmes*. Auckland: Auckland UniServices Limited.

Philips, D., Roddick, S., & Weenink, M. (2000). The strategic research initiative literature reviews. In I. Livingstone (Ed.), *New Zealand Annual Review of Education: Te arotake a tau te ao o te mataurangi i Aotearoa*. Wellington: Victoria University Press.

Pollard, A., Broadfoot, P., Croll, P., Osborn, M., & Abbott, D. (1994). *Changing English primary schools? The impact of the Education Reform Act at key stage one*. London: Cassell.

Renwick, M., & Gray, A. (1995). *Implementing the New Zealand curriculum in primary schools*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Senk, S.L., Beckmann, C.E., & Thompson, D.R. (1997). Assessment and grading in high school mathematics classrooms. *Journal of Research in Mathematics Education*, *28*, 187–215.

Williams, R. (2001). *Formative assessment: Facts, fantasies and falsehoods.* Paper presented at the annual conference of the New Zealand Association for Research in Education, Christchurch, 6–9 December.

Wylie, C. (1999). *Ten years on: How schools view educational reform.* Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

APPENDIX A

Complete English data for those responses that were summarised in the results section

Table 67

Frequency of Use of the English Tools and Strategies

Assessment Tool	Frequency of Use	Year 5 %	Year 7 %	Year 9 %
Assessment Resource Banks	Once a year	4	24	28
	2-5 times a year	46	40	33
	6-9 times a year	23	20	22
	10-20 times a year	23	8	17
	Weekly	4	8	0
	Daily	0	0	0
Burt Word Reading Test	Once a year	38	28	38
	2-5 times a year	61	68	38
	6-9 times a year	2	3	0
	10-20 times a year	0	1	13
	Weekly	0	0	13
	Daily	0	0	0
Competition tests such as the Australian tests	Once a year	90	87	98
	2-5 times a year	5	11	2
	6-9 times a year	2	1	0
	10-20 times a year	4	0	0
	Weekly	0	0	0
	Daily	0	0	0
Graded Word Spelling Test	Once a year	25	0	75
	2-5 times a year	75	38	0
	6-9 times a year	0	0	25
	10-20 times a year	0	12	0
	Weekly	0	0	0
	Daily	0	0	0
National Educational Monitoring Project tasks	Once a year	54	55	56
	2-5 times a year	38	30	50
	6-9 times a year	8	15	0
	10-20 times a year	0	0	0
	Weekly	0	0	0
	Daily	0	0	0
Neale Analysis of Reading Ability	Once a year	4	29	33
	2-5 times a year	79	71	0
	6-9 times a year	14	0	33
	10-20 times a year	0	0	33
	Weekly	4	0	0
	Daily	0	0	-0
Peters Spelling Checklist	Once a year	4	29	33
	2-5 times a year	79	71	0
	6-9 times a year	14	0	33
	10-20 times a year	0	0	33
	Weekly	4	0	0
	Daily	0	0	0

Table 67 (contd.)

Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension	Once a year	100	97	95
	2-5 times a year	0	3	3
	6-9 times a year	0	0	1
	10-20 times a year	0	0	1
	Weekly	0	0	0
	Daily	0	0	0
Progressive Achievement Test: Reading	Once a year	97	96	95
	2-5 times a year	3	4	4
	6-9 times a year	0	0	0
	10-20 times a year	0	0	1
	Weekly	0	0	0
	Daily	0	0	0
Proof Reading Tests of Spelling	Once a year	62	72	80
	2-5 times a year	35	28	0
	6-9 times a year	4	0	0
	10-20 times a year	0	0	20
	Weekly	0	0	0
	Daily	0	0	0
Reading Prose Inventory	Once a year	12	12	33
	2-5 times a year	74	77	33
	6-9 times a year	10	8	0
	10-20 times a year	0	4	22
	Weekly	4	0	11
	Daily	0	0	0
Schonell Spelling Test	Once a year	21	11	63
	2-5 times a year	74	81	13
	6-9 times a year	2	6	0
	10-20 times a year	0	2	25
	Weekly	2	0	0
	Daily	0	0	0
Supplementary Tests of Achievement in Reading	Once a year	74	80	80
	2-5 times a year	23	13	0
	6-9 times a year	0	7	0
	10-20 times a year	0	0	20
	Weekly	0	0	0
	Daily	0	0	0
Tests of Reading Comprehension	Once a year	47	44	100
	2-5 times a year	47	28	0
	6-9 times a year	0	17	0
	10-20 times a year	100	0	0
	Weekly	0	100	0
	Daily	0	0	0
Assignments or homework	Once a year	0	0	1
	2-5 times a year	2	5	2
	6-9 times a year	2	5	2
	10-20 times a year	12	6	16
	Weekly	74	70	41
	Daily	11	14	38
Checklists or rating scales	Once a year	0	0	0
	2-5 times a year	15	11	21
	6-9 times a year	22	10	15
	10-20 times a year	31	29	39
	Weekly	27	39	18
	Daily	5	11	6

Table 67 (contd.)

Conferencing or interviews	Once a year	4	1	5
	2-5 times a year	18	23	63
	6-9 times a year	10	13	14
	10-20 times a year	16	20	5
	Weekly	41	32	12
	Daily	11	11	2
Exams	Once a year	17	40	56
	2-5 times a year	50	27	40
	6-9 times a year	17	13	3
	10-20 times a year	17	13	0
	Weekly	0	7	1
	Daily	1	0	0
Exemplars	Once a year	14	19	2
	2-5 times a year	64	49	24
	6-9 times a year	8	16	36
	10-20 times a year	11	8	24
	Weekly	3	5	9
	Daily	0	3	5
Observation	Once a year	0	1	4
	2-5 times a year	3	3	15
	6-9 times a year	5	4	15
	10-20 times a year	11	11	10
	Weekly	19	30	18
	Daily	61	51	38
Peer assessment	Once a year	0	0	3
	2-5 times a year	16	20	48
	6-9 times a year	26	18	28
	10-20 times a year	27	40	10
	Weekly	29	20	7
	Daily	2	2	4
Portfolios or work samples	Once a year	4	2	7
	2-5 times a year	39	42	49
	6-9 times a year	24	19	28
	10-20 times a year	28	28	12
	Weekly	6	8	4
	Daily	0	1	0
School developed tests	Once a year	4	9	11
	2-5 times a year	58	51	48
	6-9 times a year	19	13	33
	10-20 times a year	19	27	8
	Weekly	0	0	0
	Daily	0	0	0
Student-self assessment	Once a year	0	2	6
	2-5 times a year	26	24	54
	6-9 times a year	28	17	22
	10-20 times a year	27	45	7
	Weekly	17	8	6
	Daily	4	3	4
Teacher written tests	Once a year	0	1	4
	2-5 times a year	22	19	20
	6-9 times a year	27	27	40
	10-20 times a year	43	42	30
	Weekly	7	10	5
	Daily	1	0	1

Table 68

Information Recorded by Teachers from the English Tools and Strategies

Assessment Tool	Information Recorded	Year 5 %	Year 7 %	Year 9 %
Assessment Resource Banks	Nothing recorded	12	15	5
	Raw score/percent	46	30	53
	Grade	15	4	32
	Curriculum level	23	30	42
	Normed score	8	4	5
	Written comment	23	30	11
	Other	0	4	0
Burt Word Reading Test	Nothing recorded	0	0	0
	Raw score/percent	58	56	56
	Grade	25	15	33
	Curriculum level	3	4	11
	Normed score	29	29	22
	Written comment	8	4	22
	Other	0	0	0
Competition tests such as the Australian tests	Nothing recorded	41	22	29
	Raw score/percent	34	40	35
	Grade	17	20	11
	Curriculum level	0	1	4
	Normed score	14	16	5
	Written comment	2	11	4
	Other	0	1	2
Graded Word Spelling Test	Nothing recorded	0	0	20
	Raw score/percent	50	61	80
	Grade	38	28	20
	Curriculum level	0	11	0
	Normed score	25	22	0
	Written comment	0	0	0
	Other	0	0	0
National Educational Monitoring Project tasks	Nothing recorded	20	43	33
	Raw score/percent	20	14	67
	Grade	7	24	33
	Curriculum level	20	29	33
	Normed score	0	10	0
	Written comment	27	29	0
	Other	0	0	0
Neale Analysis of Reading Ability	Nothing recorded	0	0	33
	Raw score/percent	0	67	67
	Grade	50	0	33
	Curriculum level	0	0	33
	Normed score	0	33	0
	Written comment	0	0	0
	Other	0	0	0
Peters Spelling Checklist	Nothing recorded	4	0	33
	Raw score/percent	50	38	33
	Grade	29	25	33
	Curriculum level	4	14	33
	Normed score	32	25	33
	Written comment	0	7	0
	Other	4	0	0

Table 68 (contd.)

Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension	Nothing recorded	1	0	0
	Raw score/percent	81	71	55
	Grade	16	12	17
	Curriculum level	3	8	3
	Normed score	57	53	41
	Written comment	3	6	3
	Other	2	0	0
Progressive Achievement Test: Reading	Nothing recorded	1	0	0
	Raw score/percent	79	73	57
	Grade	16	11	15
	Curriculum level	3	8	2
	Normed score	55	51	38
	Written comment	4	6	2
	Other	2	0	0
Proof Reading Tests of Spelling	Nothing recorded	7	0	20
	Raw score/percent	74	56	30
	Grade	15	11	40
	Curriculum level	7	22	20
	Normed score	33	33	40
	Written comment	7	28	0
	Other	0	0	0
Reading Prose Inventory	Nothing recorded	0	0	20
	Raw score/percent	55	50	20
	Grade	19	31	20
	Curriculum level	11	17	10
	Normed score	21	13	30
	Written comment	42	56	20
	Other	0	0	0
Schonell Spelling Test	Nothing recorded	2	0	11
	Raw score/percent	52	60	56
	Grade	29	19	0
	Curriculum level	2	2	0
	Normed score	31	27	11
	Written comment	7	4	0
	Other	0	2	0
Supplementary Tests of Achievement in Reading	Nothing recorded	0	0	40
	Raw score/percent	71	67	20
	Grade	29	20	0
	Curriculum level	3	7	0
	Normed score	61	27	0
	Written comment	3	13	0
	Other	3	0	0
Tests of Reading Comprehension	Nothing recorded	0	0	0
	Raw score/percent	53	53	56
	Grade	35	32	44
	Curriculum level	18	5	11
	Normed score	18	16	11
	Written comment	12	53	0
	Other	0	53	0

Table 68 (contd.)

Assignments or homework	Nothing recorded	8	7	1
	Raw score/percent	6	21	41
	Grade	16	25	42
	Curriculum level	6	7	18
	Normed score	0	2	6
	Written comment	76	69	55
	Other	2	1	2
Checklists or rating scales	Nothing recorded	6	3	24
	Raw score/percent	32	27	21
	Grade	28	40	15
	Curriculum level	37	41	18
	Normed score	0	7	0
	Written comment	47	36	21
	Other	3	4	0
Conferencing or interviews	Nothing recorded	16	18	32
	Raw score/percent	4	5	5
	Grade	6	5	10
	Curriculum level	10	5	7
	Normed score	1	2	2
	Written comment	75	74	50
	Other	1	0	0
Exams	Nothing recorded	0	0	0
	Raw score/percent	80	33	80
	Grade	0	60	19
	Curriculum level	0	27	9
	Normed score	20	0	4
	Written comment	60	53	24
	Other	0	0	0
Exemplars	Nothing recorded	11	16	51
	Raw score/percent	8	8	10
	Grade	14	29	17
	Curriculum level	35	37	8
	Normed score	19	3	2
	Written comment	43	39	17
	Other	3	0	2
Observation	Nothing recorded	30	19	26
	Raw score/percent	2	6	6
	Grade	3	7	11
	Curriculum level	9	7	4
	Normed score	1	1	1
	Written comment	76	78	56
	Other	1	3	0
Peer assessment	Nothing recorded	27	18	23
	Raw score/percent	5	11	14
	Grade	15	17	19
	Curriculum level	5	5	7
	Normed score	1	0	1
	Written comment	50	64	60
	Other	4	1	1

Table 68 (contd.)

Portfolios or work samples	Nothing recorded	7	14	7
	Raw score/percent	8	13	23
	Grade	14	26	37
	Curriculum level	24	24	17
	Normed score	1	2	2
	Written comment	79	68	52
	Other	1	3	0
School developed tests	Nothing recorded	2	0	0
	Raw score/percent	35	48	70
	Grade	29	46	40
	Curriculum level	46	39	22
	Normed score	2	5	5
	Written comment	40	41	31
	Other	0	0	0
Student self assessment	Nothing recorded	19	12	26
	Raw score/percent	4	12	16
	Grade	12	18	21
	Curriculum level	7	10	10
	Normed score	0	2	1
	Written comment	67	66	34
	Other	3	3	3
Teacher written tests	Nothing recorded	5	1	1
	Raw score/percent	48	55	64
	Grade	29	32	33
	Curriculum level	23	21	14
	Normed score	1	3	1
	Written comment	58	61	36
	Other	0	3	1

Table 69

Teachers' Use of Information from the English Tools and Strategies

Assessment Tool	To Provide Information for	Year 5 %	Year 7 %	Year 9 %
Assessment Resource Banks	Teaching and learning	92	93	90
	Monitoring progress	88	63	68
	Students	54	37	53
	Parents or caregivers	42	37	47
	Next years teacher	31	22	53
	School management	20	19	32
	External agencies	19	26	42
Burt Word Reading Test	Teaching and learning	85	75	89
	Monitoring progress	80	80	88
	Students	43	28	67
	Parents or caregivers	54	47	78
	Next years teacher	63	53	67
	School management	38	49	56
	External agencies	32	40	56
Competition Tests	Teaching and learning	46	54	44
	Monitoring progress	31	43	47
	Students	66	80	76
	Parents or caregivers	68	74	64
	Next years teacher	27	30	29
	School management	41	44	40
	External agencies	15	26	27
Graded Word Spelling Test	Teaching and learning	63	78	80
	Monitoring progress	75	78	80
	Students	25	56	60
	Parents or caregivers	63	39	60
	Next years teacher	63	33	60
	School management	36	44	60
	External agencies	0	22	60
National Educational Monitoring Project	Teaching and learning	71	62	67
	Monitoring progress	67	48	67
	Students	47	14	67
	Parents or caregivers	33	19	67
	Next years teacher	20	14	67
	School management	47	14	67
	External agencies	20	14	67
Neale Analysis of Reading Ability	Teaching and learning	50	67	67
	Monitoring progress	50	67	67
	Students	50	33	67
	Parents or caregivers	0	33	67
	Next years teacher	0	67	67
	School management	0	67	67
	External agencies	50	33	67
Peters Spelling Checklist	Teaching and learning	79	82	100
	Monitoring progress	86	79	100
	Students	61	54	100
	Parents or caregivers	68	54	100
	Next years teacher	71	64	67
	School management	39	46	47
	External agencies	29	25	67

Table 69 (contd.)

Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension	Teaching and learning	83	80	74
	Monitoring progress	71	75	71
	Students	28	26	35
	Parents or caregivers	70	63	45
	Next years teacher	57	66	64
	School management	76	73	62
	External agencies	45	43	44
Progressive Achievement Test: Reading	Teaching and learning	83	83	74
	Monitoring progress	73	73	69
	Students	26	28	33
	Parents or caregivers	67	61	45
	Next years teacher	58	67	62
	School management	73	72	64
	External agencies	46	45	44
Proof Reading Tests of Spelling	Teaching and learning	74	78	100
	Monitoring progress	67	78	100
	Students	37	28	80
	Parents or caregivers	67	11	80
	Next years teacher	48	61	100
	School management	52	38	80
	External agencies	33	28	100
Reading Prose Inventory	Teaching and learning	87	94	90
	Monitoring progress	79	90	90
	Students	57	58	70
	Parents or caregivers	74	75	50
	Next years teacher	72	71	50
	School management	58	62	60
	External agencies	32	44	50
Schonell Spelling Test	Teaching and learning	86	83	78
	Monitoring progress	81	83	89
	Students	69	58	67
	Parents or caregivers	64	65	56
	Next years teacher	57	69	56
	School management	50	52	33
	External agencies	39	31	33
Supplementary Tests of Achievement in Reading	Teaching and learning	90	100	80
	Monitoring progress	77	73	60
	Students	48	53	60
	Parents or caregivers	61	60	40
	Next years teacher	58	53	40
	School management	71	53	40
	External agencies	35	47	60
Tests of Reading Comprehension	Teaching and learning	82	95	89
	Monitoring progress	71	84	67
	Students	24	37	67
	Parents or caregivers	59	47	67
	Next years teacher	47	58	67
	School management	35	33	67
	External agencies	18	11	33

Table 69 (contd.)

Assignments or homework	Teaching and learning	83	90	91
	Monitoring progress	65	71	85
	Students	80	90	80
	Parents or caregivers	75	87	70
	Next years teacher	23	27	32
	School management	25	28	38
	External agencies	20	27	30
Checklists or rating scales	Teaching and learning	89	89	85
	Monitoring progress	89	89	71
	Students	52	59	65
	Parents or caregivers	46	58	41
	Next years teacher	35	36	26
	School management	34	33	32
	External agencies	27	29	26
Conferencing or interviews	Teaching and learning	87	84	73
	Monitoring progress	78	78	75
	Students	84	84	78
	Parents or caregivers	53	50	55
	Next years teacher	23	26	28
	School management	24	26	37
	External agencies	17	22	22
Exams	Teaching and learning	80	47	70
	Monitoring progress	100	73	85
	Students	100	73	80
	Parents or caregivers	100	33	80
	Next years teacher	80	40	63
	School management	60	33	64
	External agencies	20	27	38
Exemplars	Teaching and learning	78	76	83
	Monitoring progress	78	74	36
	Students	49	66	75
	Parents or caregivers	54	53	29
	Next years teacher	51	47	36
	School management	73	71	24
	External agencies	38	45	37
Observation	Teaching and learning	93	90	84
	Monitoring progress	84	84	79
	Students	62	61	51
	Parents or caregivers	55	50	43
	Next years teacher	30	41	31
	School management	27	31	33
	External agencies	22	26	24
Peer assessment	Teaching and learning	77	71	86
	Monitoring progress	61	50	73
	Students	89	85	87
	Parents or caregivers	34	36	40
	Next years teacher	21	28	37
	School management	24	26	31
	External agencies	20	25	30

Table 69 (contd.)

Portfolios or work samples	Teaching and learning	78	69	72
	Monitoring progress	77	71	72
	Students	73	73	65
	Parents or caregivers	77	82	55
	Next years teacher	58	57	43
	School management	48	46	30
	External agencies	25	35	32
School developed tests	Teaching and learning	83	93	89
	Monitoring progress	90	84	83
	Students	63	55	77
	Parents or caregivers	58	55	71
	Next years teacher	42	52	57
	School management	44	52	57
	External agencies	21	34	38
Student-self assessment	Teaching and learning	77	66	80
	Monitoring progress	62	59	74
	Students	87	79	87
	Parents or caregivers	44	50	46
	Next years teacher	24	27	34
	School management	18	25	27
	External agencies	16	24	30
Teacher written tests	Teaching and learning	90	87	87
	Monitoring progress	89	86	90
	Students	73	66	84
	Parents or caregivers	52	57	67
	Next years teacher	34	44	39
	School management	30	32	40
	External agencies	20	25	28

Table 70

Teachers' Rating of the Usefulness of the English Tools and Strategies for Providing Information for 'Teaching and Learning'

Assessment Tool	Frequency of Use	Year 5 %	Year 7 %	Year 9 %
Assessment Resource Banks	Of little or no use	0	0	6
	of some use	13	36	24
	useful	54	20	41
	very useful	33	44	29
Burt Word Reading Test	Of little or no use	0	8	0
	of some use	35	27	25
	useful	37	39	50
	very useful	27	24	25
Competition tests	Of little or no use	11	18	29
	of some use	37	39	33
	useful	37	27	21
	very useful	16	16	8
Graded Word Spelling Test	Of little or no use	0	14	50
	of some use	0	21	0
	useful	60	14	50
	very useful	40	43	0
National Education Monitoring Project tasks	Of little or no use	0	0	50
	of some use	0	31	0
	useful	60	31	50
	very useful	40	38	0
Neale Analysis	Of little or no use	0	0	50
	of some use	0	50	0
	useful	0	0	50
	very useful	100	50	0
Peters Spelling	Of little or no use	0	13	33
	of some use	23	26	0
	useful	50	35	67
	very useful	23	22	0
Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension	Of little or no use	2	8	10
	of some use	41	27	28
	useful	34	42	40
	very useful	21	22	21
Progressive Achievement Test: Reading	Of little or no use	2	6	11
	of some use	37	29	23
	useful	37	40	42
	very useful	24	24	23
Proof Reading Tests of Spelling	Of little or no use	5	0	0
	of some use	35	36	60
	useful	45	36	40
	very useful	15	29	0
Reading Prose Inventory	Of little or no use	0	0	11
	of some use	7	10	22
	useful	20	31	56
	very useful	74	57	11
Schonell Spelling Test	Of little or no use	0	0	14
	of some use	25	15	29
	useful	39	55	57
	very useful	36	28	0

Table 70 (contd.)

Supplementary Tests of Achievement in Reading – STAR	Of little or no use	0	7	25
	of some use	25	13	25
	useful	46	60	50
	very useful	29	20	0
Tests of Reading Comprehension	Of little or no use	0	0	13
	of some use	7	0	50
	useful	36	28	38
	very useful	57	67	0
Assignments or homework	Of little or no use	2	0	1
	of some use	20	15	9
	useful	49	52	33
	very useful	29	31	56
Checklists or rating scales	Of little or no use	1	0	7
	of some use	11	11	21
	useful	49	46	31
	very useful	39	42	41
Conferencing or interviews	Of little or no use	0	0	0
	of some use	3	6	9
	useful	27	30	34
	very useful	71	60	55
Exams	Of little or no use	0	0	5
	of some use	0	14	16
	useful	50	43	41
	very useful	25	43	38
Exemplars	Of little or no use	0	0	0
	of some use	14	0	14
	useful	38	31	27
	very useful	48	69	59
Observation	Of little or no use	0	0	2
	of some use	3	9	15
	useful	21	27	29
	very useful	74	63	53
Peer assessment	Of little or no use	1	6	7
	of some use	32	20	20
	useful	36	49	53
	very useful	31	22	20
Portfolios or work samples	Of little or no use	7	3	7
	of some use	29	28	23
	useful	33	32	30
	very useful	31	34	40
School developed tests	Of little or no use	3	0	3
	of some use	18	17	15
	useful	38	48	44
	very useful	43	33	38
Student-self assessment	Of little or no use	4	2	4
	of some use	22	25	25
	useful	42	51	45
	very useful	32	20	25
Teacher written tests	Of little or no use	0	1	1
	of some use	5	6	6
	useful	32	28	42
	very useful	63	64	51

Table 71

Teachers' Rating of the Usefulness of the English Tools and Strategies for Providing Information for 'Monitoring Progress'

Assessment Tool	Frequency of Use	Year 5 %	Year 7 %	Year 9 %
Assessment Resource Banks	Of little or no use	0	0	8
	of some use	22	24	23
	useful	52	29	62
	very useful	26	41	8
Burt Word Reading Test	Of little or no use	0	9	0
	of some use	31	19	38
	useful	42	56	38
	very useful	25	15	25
Competition tests	Of little or no use	17	29	23
	of some use	28	34	42
	useful	22	26	19
	very useful	33	11	15
Graded Word Spelling Test	Of little or no use	0	0	50
	of some use	0	21	0
	useful	67	43	25
	very useful	33	29	25
National Education Monitoring Project tasks	Of little or no use	0	20	50
	of some use	30	20	50
	useful	20	40	0
	very useful	50	20	0
Neale Analysis of Reading Ability	Of little or no use	0	0	50
	of some use	100	50	50
	useful	0	50	0
	very useful	0	0	0
Peters Spelling Checklist	Of little or no use	0	5	33
	of some use	25	14	33
	useful	50	50	33
	very useful	25	32	0
Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension	Of little or no use	6	5	7
	of some use	34	33	27
	useful	40	29	38
	very useful	19	31	27
Progressive Achievement Test: Reading	Of little or no use	7	5	7
	of some use	32	30	24
	useful	38	33	41
	very useful	24	30	28
Proof Reading Tests of Spelling	Of little or no use	0	0	0
	of some use	32	29	60
	useful	50	50	40
	very useful	17	21	0
Reading Prose Inventory	Of little or no use	0	0	11
	of some use	10	4	22
	useful	10	30	44
	very useful	81	64	22
Schonell Spelling Test	Of little or no use	0	0	13
	of some use	18	10	13
	useful	35	53	75
	very useful	47	35	0

Table 71 (contd.)

Supplementary Tests of Achievement in Reading	Of little or no use	8	0	67
	of some use	17	18	0
	useful	50	55	33
	very useful	25	27	0
Tests of Reading Comprehension	Of little or no use	0	0	17
	of some use	8	0	50
	useful	50	44	33
	very useful	42	50	0
Assignments or homework	Of little or no use	8	3	4
	of some use	20	18	10
	useful	48	58	35
	very useful	24	19	49
Checklists or rating scales	Of little or no use	1	0	4
	of some use	10	12	8
	useful	57	46	46
	very useful	31	42	42
Conferencing or interviews	Of little or no use	0	1	0
	of some use	9	13	18
	useful	38	34	38
	very useful	52	50	42
Exams	Of little or no use	0	0	1
	of some use	0	0	18
	useful	20	82	43
	very useful	60	18	35
Exemplars	Of little or no use	7	4	10
	of some use	21	7	24
	useful	31	36	43
	very useful	41	54	24
Observation	Of little or no use	0	0	2
	of some use	9	10	15
	useful	31	30	34
	very useful	59	59	49
Peer assessment	Of little or no use	11	11	16
	of some use	40	26	39
	useful	23	43	31
	very useful	26	17	12
Portfolios or work samples	Of little or no use	4	5	7
	of some use	27	15	21
	useful	41	42	30
	very useful	28	36	42
School developed tests	Of little or no use	0	0	0
	of some use	14	17	6
	useful	47	43	42
	very useful	40	38	52
Student-self assessment	Of little or no use	10	7	12
	of some use	37	30	33
	useful	32	39	33
	very useful	19	20	21
Teacher written tests	Of little or no use	0	1	0
	of some use	9	8	4
	useful	31	18	47
	very useful	58	71	48

Table 72

Teachers' Rating of the Usefulness of the English Tools and Strategies for Providing Information for 'Students'

Assessment Tool	Frequency of Use	Year 5 %	Year 7 %	Year 9 %
Assessment Resource Banks	Of little or no use	7	10	30
	of some use	36	30	30
	useful	50	30	30
	very useful	7	30	20
Burt Word Reading Test	Of little or no use	7	5	17
	of some use	43	37	33
	useful	39	26	50
	very useful	7	21	0
Competition tests	Of little or no use	3	9	5
	of some use	49	29	43
	useful	27	43	38
	very useful	21	17	14
Graded Word Spelling Test	Of little or no use	0	10	33
	of some use	0	30	33
	useful	50	40	0
	very useful	50	10	33
National Education Monitoring Project tasks	Of little or no use	0	33	50
	of some use	57	0	0
	useful	14	67	50
	very useful	29	0	0
Neale Analysis of Reading Ability	Of little or no use	0	0	50
	of some use	100	100	0
	useful	0	0	50
	very useful	0	0	0
Peters Spelling Checklist	Of little or no use	0	7	33
	of some use	29	27	33
	useful	53	53	33
	very useful	12	13	0
Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension	Of little or no use	43	19	30
	of some use	27	48	33
	useful	23	19	30
	very useful	3	15	7
Progressive Achievement Test: Reading	Of little or no use	41	24	25
	of some use	28	38	36
	useful	24	21	25
	very useful	7	17	14
Proof Reading Tests of Spelling	Of little or no use	30	0	25
	of some use	20	20	50
	useful	50	40	25
	very useful	0	40	0
Reading Prose Inventory	Of little or no use	6	3	14
	of some use	13	17	29
	useful	43	37	43
	very useful	33	40	14
Schonell Spelling Test	Of little or no use	4	0	33
	of some use	34	18	0
	useful	41	61	50
	very useful	21	18	17

Table 72 (contd.)

Supplementary Tests of Achievement in Reading	Of little or no use	33	0	33
	of some use	33	0	33
	useful	20	75	33
	very useful	13	25	0
Tests of Reading Comprehension	Of little or no use	0	0	83
	of some use	50	14	0
	useful	50	29	17
	very useful	0	43	0
Assignments or homework	Of little or no use	0	1	3
	of some use	22	15	15
	useful	48	53	36
	very useful	30	29	45
Checklists or rating scales	Of little or no use	2	5	9
	of some use	39	12	5
	useful	39	47	37
	very useful	20	35	50
Conferencing or interviews	Of little or no use	0	0	0
	of some use	7	7	11
	useful	26	34	40
	very useful	66	56	45
Exams	Of little or no use	0	0	0
	of some use	40	0	22
	useful	40	73	31
	very useful	0	27	45
Exemplars	Of little or no use	17	4	0
	of some use	39	12	16
	useful	28	44	23
	very useful	17	40	62
Observation	Of little or no use	6	3	6
	of some use	14	17	22
	useful	34	45	28
	very useful	46	33	42
Peer assessment	Of little or no use	4	1	2
	of some use	17	14	23
	useful	41	45	48
	very useful	39	37	26
Portfolios or work samples	Of little or no use	1	3	10
	of some use	28	16	15
	useful	38	52	38
	very useful	31	27	36
School developed tests	Of little or no use	3	3	0
	of some use	23	19	12
	useful	53	45	46
	very useful	20	32	32
Student-self assessment	Of little or no use	0	0	3
	of some use	15	19	18
	useful	43	34	48
	very useful	43	44	30
Teacher written tests	Of little or no use	2	2	0
	of some use	13	8	9
	useful	46	39	49
	very useful	38	49	41

Table 73

Teachers' Rating of the Usefulness of the English Tools and Strategies for Providing Information for 'Parents or Caregivers'

Assessment Tool	Frequency of Use	Year 5 %	Year 7 %	Year 9 %
Assessment Resource Banks	Of little or no use	9	10	67
	of some use	27	40	0
	useful	45	10	11
	very useful	18	40	22
Burt Word Reading Test	Of little or no use	3	9	0
	of some use	60	28	29
	useful	20	38	71
	very useful	17	22	0
Competition tests	Of little or no use	5	5	3
	of some use	25	30	49
	useful	38	45	37
	very useful	28	18	11
Graded Word Spelling Test	Of little or no use	0	0	33
	of some use	40	43	33
	useful	40	43	33
	very useful	20	14	0
National Education Monitoring Project tasks	Of little or no use	0	33	0
	of some use	0	0	50
	useful	33	33	50
	very useful	67	33	0
Neale Analysis of Reading Ability	Of little or no use	0	100	50
	of some use	0	0	50
	useful	0	0	0
	very useful	0	0	0
Peters Spelling Checklist	Of little or no use	5	27	33
	of some use	26	0	33
	useful	37	53	33
	very useful	26	13	0
Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension	Of little or no use	11	11	9
	of some use	41	45	37
	useful	32	26	34
	very useful	17	12	20
Progressive Achievement Test: Reading	Of little or no use	8	10	8
	of some use	41	42	37
	useful	31	29	34
	very useful	20	16	21
Proof Reading Tests of Spelling	Of little or no use	6	9	0
	of some use	39	45	75
	useful	44	27	25
	very useful	11	9	0
Reading Prose Inventory	Of little or no use	3	3	40
	of some use	15	3	20
	useful	31	41	40
	very useful	51	51	0
Schonell Spelling Test	Of little or no use	4	6	40
	of some use	33	26	0
	useful	37	42	0
	very useful	26	23	40

Table 73 (contd.)

Supplementary Tests of Achievement in Reading	Of little or no use	16	0	50
	of some use	37	22	50
	useful	37	67	0
	very useful	11	11	0
Tests of Reading Comprehension	Of little or no use	0	0	17
	of some use	40	11	50
	useful	30	22	33
	very useful	30	67	0
Assignments or homework	Of little or no use	1	1	1
	of some use	24	23	18
	useful	46	49	38
	very useful	28	24	40
Checklists or rating scales	Of little or no use	3	10	7
	of some use	44	19	21
	useful	44	48	43
	very useful	8	19	29
Conferencing or interviews	Of little or no use	9	12	9
	of some use	19	14	15
	useful	34	31	45
	very useful	36	39	27
Exams	Of little or no use	0	0	2
	of some use	20	0	13
	useful	40	60	44
	very useful	20	40	41
Exemplars	Of little or no use	20	5	24
	of some use	10	10	29
	useful	35	65	35
	very useful	35	20	12
Observation	Of little or no use	10	9	23
	of some use	19	15	27
	useful	41	28	27
	very useful	30	43	23
Peer assessment	Of little or no use	19	27	54
	of some use	48	33	29
	useful	28	18	14
	very useful	13	15	4
Portfolios or work samples	Of little or no use	6	2	6
	of some use	16	7	12
	useful	35	36	48
	very useful	42	52	33
School developed tests	Of little or no use	4	3	2
	of some use	32	23	11
	useful	39	45	45
	very useful	25	29	42
Student-self assessment	Of little or no use	11	9	16
	of some use	32	33	44
	useful	36	35	25
	very useful	20	22	13
Teacher written tests	Of little or no use	4	0	2
	of some use	32	23	14
	useful	43	34	54
	very useful	21	41	29

Table 74

Teachers' Rating of the Usefulness of the English Tools and Strategies for Providing Information for 'Next Year's Teachers'

Assessment Tool	Frequency of Use	Year 5 %	Year 7 %	Year 9 %
Assessment Resource Banks	Of little or no use	25	33	20
	of some use	50	50	40
	useful	25	17	20
	very useful	0	0	20
Burt Word Reading Test	Of little or no use	2	17	0
	of some use	34	31	33
	useful	37	39	50
	very useful	20	11	17
Competition tests	Of little or no use	19	33	19
	of some use	25	33	50
	useful	31	17	31
	very useful	13	17	0
Graded Word Spelling Test	Of little or no use	0	17	33
	of some use	0	0	33
	useful	60	33	0
	very useful	40	50	33
National Education Monitoring Project tasks	Of little or no use	0	0	50
	of some use	33	33	50
	useful	0	0	0
	very useful	67	33	0
Neale Analysis of Reading Ability	Of little or no use	0	50	50
	of some use	0	50	50
	useful	0	0	0
	very useful	0	0	0
Peters Spelling Checklist	Of little or no use	0	6	50
	of some use	20	28	50
	useful	45	44	0
	very useful	35	22	0
Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension	Of little or no use	15	12	2
	of some use	37	33	30
	useful	39	35	46
	very useful	10	19	22
Progressive Achievement Test: Reading	Of little or no use	15	11	2
	of some use	35	36	29
	useful	31	33	44
	very useful	17	19	25
Proof Reading Tests of Spelling	Of little or no use	8	0	0
	of some use	38	27	60
	useful	46	45	40
	very useful	8	18	0
Reading Prose Inventory	Of little or no use	0	0	20
	of some use	11	11	20
	useful	37	30	60
	very useful	53	57	0
Schonell Spelling Test	Of little or no use	4	12	20
	of some use	21	21	20
	useful	46	45	40
	very useful	29	18	20

Table 74 (contd.)

Supplementary Tests of Achievement in Reading	Of little or no use	6	0	50
	of some use	17	0	0
	useful	61	100	50
	very useful	11	0	0
Tests of Reading Comprehension	Of little or no use	13	0	0
	of some use	0	19	67
	useful	50	19	17
	very useful	38	55	17
Assignments or homework	Of little or no use	64	37	33
	of some use	20	22	33
	useful	4	33	27
	very useful	4	4	7
Checklists or rating scales	Of little or no use	11	15	0
	of some use	32	23	44
	useful	39	46	44
	very useful	14	12	11
Conferencing or interviews	Of little or no use	52	32	24
	of some use	24	16	53
	useful	20	32	18
	very useful	4	16	6
Exams	Of little or no use	0	17	0
	of some use	25	17	30
	useful	25	17	40
	very useful	25	33	30
Exemplars	Of little or no use	16	11	24
	of some use	11	33	29
	useful	42	33	19
	very useful	32	17	29
Observation	Of little or no use	24	16	36
	of some use	29	19	9
	useful	24	33	41
	very useful	24	28	14
Peer assessment	Of little or no use	50	50	62
	of some use	25	27	27
	useful	5	12	12
	very useful	15	8	0
Portfolios or work samples	Of little or no use	11	5	12
	of some use	27	19	19
	useful	27	39	46
	very useful	34	36	23
School developed tests	Of little or no use	5	7	5
	of some use	35	71	27
	useful	30	41	36
	very useful	25	17	30
Student-self assessment	Of little or no use	38	44	29
	of some use	38	20	50
	useful	17	24	17
	very useful	4	8	4
Teacher written tests	Of little or no use	18	15	6
	of some use	36	21	44
	useful	32	35	34
	very useful	11	26	13

Table 75

Teachers' Rating of the Usefulness of the English Tools and Strategies for Providing Information for 'School Management'

Assessment Tool	Frequency of Use	Year 5 %	Year 7 %	Year 9 %
Assessment Resource Banks	Of little or no use	20	20	33
	of some use	20	40	0
	useful	60	40	50
	very useful	0	0	17
Burt Word Reading Test	Of little or no use	4	3	0
	of some use	28	33	20
	useful	52	37	80
	very useful	8	21	0
Competition tests	Of little or no use	8	14	14
	of some use	21	50	37
	useful	54	19	23
	very useful	17	17	23
Graded Word Spelling Test	Of little or no use	0	0	67
	of some use	0	25	0
	useful	100	38	33
	very useful	0	25	0
National Education Monitoring Project tasks	Of little or no use	0	0	50
	of some use	14	0	0
	useful	57	33	50
	very useful	29	67	0
Neale Analysis of Reading Ability	Of little or no use	0	0	50
	of some use	0	100	0
	useful	0	0	50
	very useful	0	0	0
Peters Spelling Checklist	Of little or no use	0	8	50
	of some use	36	23	0
	useful	45	38	50
	very useful	9	23	0
Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension	Of little or no use	6	7	4
	of some use	18	30	17
	useful	61	39	50
	very useful	13	21	27
Progressive Achievement Test: Reading	Of little or no use	5	8	6
	of some use	18	27	20
	useful	56	41	46
	very useful	20	21	26
Proof Reading Tests of Spelling	Of little or no use	0	14	0
	of some use	43	43	50
	useful	50	29	50
	very useful	7	14	0
Reading Prose Inventory	Of little or no use	0	0	17
	of some use	16	9	0
	useful	35	34	83
	very useful	45	56	0
Schonell Spelling Test	Of little or no use	19	8	33
	of some use	14	32	67
	useful	33	40	0
	very useful	33	12	0

Table 75 (contd.)

Supplementary Tests of Achievement in Reading	Of little or no use	5	13	50
	of some use	14	25	0
	useful	55	63	50
	very useful	23	0	0
Tests of Reading Comprehension	Of little or no use	0	0	17
	of some use	33	17	33
	useful	50	17	50
	very useful	17	50	0
Assignments or homework	Of little or no use	56	36	26
	of some use	33	21	37
	useful	11	36	23
	very useful	0	4	14
Checklists or rating scales	Of little or no use	15	17	9
	of some use	26	21	45
	useful	56	50	36
	very useful	4	13	9
Conferencing or interviews	Of little or no use	39	24	27
	of some use	50	32	36
	useful	12	32	14
	very useful	0	12	18
Exams	Of little or no use	0	20	6
	of some use	0	20	20
	useful	0	40	43
	very useful	67	20	29
Exemplars	Of little or no use	7	15	43
	of some use	15	7	43
	useful	33	48	14
	very useful	44	30	0
Observation	Of little or no use	39	12	43
	of some use	26	36	13
	useful	23	36	35
	very useful	10	12	9
Peer assessment	Of little or no use	65	54	73
	of some use	13	17	18
	useful	13	25	9
	very useful	4	4	0
Portfolios or work samples	Of little or no use	21	9	22
	of some use	8	19	11
	useful	38	38	50
	very useful	30	32	17
School developed tests	Of little or no use	5	0	5
	of some use	5	7	25
	useful	57	59	41
	very useful	29	31	30
Student-self assessment	Of little or no use	67	43	42
	of some use	22	30	42
	useful	11	17	16
	very useful	0	9	0
Teacher written tests	Of little or no use	40	8	21
	of some use	24	32	33
	useful	24	36	33
	very useful	8	24	9

Table 76

Teachers' Rating of the Usefulness of the English Tools and Strategies for Providing Information for 'External Agencies'

Assessment Tool	Frequency of Use	Year 5 %	Year 7 %	Year 9 %
Assessment Resource Banks	Of little or no use	20	14	25
	of some use	60	43	25
	useful	20	14	38
	very useful	0	29	13
Burt Word Reading Test	Of little or no use	0	11	0
	of some use	42	30	20
	useful	33	48	80
	very useful	10	11	0
Competition tests	Of little or no use	22	24	20
	of some use	22	29	27
	useful	33	29	33
	very useful	11	19	20
Graded Word Spelling Test	Of little or no use	0	0	50
	of some use	0	75	0
	useful	0	25	50
	very useful	0	0	0
National Education Monitoring Project tasks	Of little or no use	0	100	50
	of some use	33	0	0
	useful	67	0	50
	very useful	0	0	0
Neale Analysis of Reading Ability	Of little or no use	0	100	50
	of some use	100	0	0
	useful	0	0	50
	very useful	0	0	0
Peters Spelling Checklist	Of little or no use	13	14	50
	of some use	25	29	0
	useful	25	43	50
	very useful	25	14	0
Progressive Achievement Test: Listening Comprehension	Of little or no use	10	2	6
	of some use	27	29	29
	useful	41	44	35
	very useful	14	20	23
Progressive Achievement Test: Reading	Of little or no use	10	2	5
	of some use	24	26	32
	useful	40	51	32
	very useful	20	17	27
Proof Reading Tests of Spelling	Of little or no use	22	0	0
	of some use	11	60	20
	useful	33	0	60
	very useful	22	20	20
Reading Prose Inventory	Of little or no use	0	0	20
	of some use	18	17	0
	useful	24	39	80
	very useful	53	39	0
Schonell Spelling Test	Of little or no use	17	20	33
	of some use	17	27	33
	useful	33	47	33
	very useful	25	0	0

Table 76 (contd.)

Supplementary Tests of Achievement in Reading	Of little or no use	18	29	33
	of some use	0	14	0
	useful	64	43	33
	very useful	0	14	33
Tests of Reading Comprehension	Of little or no use	0	0	33
	of some use	33	0	33
	useful	33	0	0
	very useful	33	50	33
Assignments or homework	Of little or no use	64	59	21
	of some use	14	11	50
	useful	14	22	11
	very useful	0	7	18
Checklists or rating scales	Of little or no use	18	36	11
	of some use	14	32	44
	useful	59	18	22
	very useful	9	14	22
Conferencing or interviews	Of little or no use	63	50	46
	of some use	26	23	8
	useful	5	18	38
	very useful	0	9	8
Exams	Of little or no use	0	50	13
	of some use	0	25	27
	useful	100	25	37
	very useful	0	0	20
Exemplars	Of little or no use	7	18	19
	of some use	7	24	44
	useful	21	29	25
	very useful	64	29	13
Observation	Of little or no use	40	41	53
	of some use	32	19	24
	useful	12	26	18
	very useful	8	11	6
Peer assessment	Of little or no use	58	57	52
	of some use	21	17	38
	useful	11	22	5
	very useful	0	4	5
Portfolios or work samples	Of little or no use	23	9	10
	of some use	19	14	35
	useful	35	34	30
	very useful	23	43	25
School developed tests	Of little or no use	10	5	7
	of some use	10	21	31
	useful	50	42	38
	very useful	20	32	24
Student-self assessment	Of little or no use	56	50	24
	of some use	19	18	43
	useful	13	27	19
	very useful	0	5	14
Teacher written tests	Of little or no use	41	21	9
	of some use	18	21	48
	useful	29	37	26
	very useful	0	21	17

APPENDIX B

Complete mathematics data for where responses were summarised in the results section

Table 77

Frequency of Use of the Mathematics Tools and Strategies

Assessment Tool	Frequency of Use	Year 5 %	Year 7 %	Year 9 %
Assessment Resource Banks	Once a year	15	11	18
	2-5 times a year	54	43	45
	6-9 times a year	21	23	18
	10-20 times a year	10	21	9
	Weekly	0	2	9
	Daily	0	0	0
Beginning School Mathematics	Once a year	20	67	50
	2-5 times a year	20	33	0
	6-9 times a year	40	0	0
	10-20 times a year	20	0	0
	Weekly	0	0	50
	Daily	0	0	0
Booker Profiles in Mathematics	Once a year	0	0	50
	2-5 times a year	0	50	50
	6-9 times a year	0	50	0
	10-20 times a year	0	0	0
	Weekly	0	0	0
	Daily	0	0	0
Competition Tests	Once a year	97	43	60
	2-5 times a year	3	41	38
	6-9 times a year	0	10	3
	10-20 times a year	0	4	0
	Weekly	0	3	0
	Daily	0	0	0
National Education Monitoring Project tasks	Once a year	32	43	43
	2-5 times a year	47	35	43
	6-9 times a year	16	17	14
	10-20 times a year	5	0	0
	Weekly	0	4	0
	Daily	0	0	0
Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics	Once a year	92	96	98
	2-5 times a year	8	4	2
	6-9 times a year	0	0	0
	10-20 times a year	0	0	0
	Weekly	0	0	0
	Daily	0	0	0
Topic and strand-based tests	Once a year	5	0	15
	2-5 times a year	25	23	54
	6-9 times a year	31	44	15
	10-20 times a year	28	29	8
	Weekly	9	4	0
	Daily	2	0	8

Table 77 (contd.)

Assignments or homework	Once a year	0	2	2
	2-5 times a year	8	3	2
	6-9 times a year	7	9	2
	10-20 times a year	7	19	10
	Weekly	71	63	39
	Daily	6	4	45
Checklist or rating scales	Once a year	3	1	6
	2-5 times a year	11	13	33
	6-9 times a year	16	19	17
	10-20 times a year	43	38	28
	Weekly	23	26	11
	Daily	4	1	6
Conferencing or interviews	Once a year	3	4	4
	2-5 times a year	24	27	57
	6-9 times a year	13	9	14
	10-20 times a year	19	15	14
	Weekly	24	25	7
	Daily	17	19	4
Exams	Once a year	25	20	45
	2-5 times a year	13	40	49
	6-9 times a year	13	33	1
	10-20 times a year	50	7	5
	Weekly	0	0	0
	Daily	0	0	0
Exemplars	Once a year	13	13	11
	2-5 times a year	40	44	33
	6-9 times a year	13	25	11
	10-20 times a year	13	6	22
	Weekly	6	13	22
	Daily	13	0	0
Observation	Once a year	0	0	2
	2-5 times a year	1	6	11
	6-9 times a year	3	6	4
	10-20 times a year	8	11	4
	Weekly	22	23	13
	Daily	65	54	68
Peer assessment	Once a year	0	2	6
	2-5 times a year	31	27	38
	6-9 times a year	21	21	19
	10-20 times a year	23	26	38
	Weekly	21	18	0
	Daily	3	6	0
Portfolios or work samples	Once a year	0	1	6
	2-5 times a year	54	48	34
	6-9 times a year	20	27	26
	10-20 times a year	16	20	23
	Weekly	5	1	9
	Daily	4	2	3
School developed tests	Once a year	4	5	2
	2-5 times a year	55	35	28
	6-9 times a year	16	36	45
	10-20 times a year	25	23	23
	Weekly	0	1	2
	Daily	0	0	0

Table 77 (contd.)

Student-self assessment	Once a year	1	3	7
	2-5 times a year	30	30	34
	6-9 times a year	24	24	21
	10-20 times a year	20	22	14
	Weekly	23	17	10
	Daily	3	2	14
Teacher written tests	Once a year	1	1	0
	2-5 times a year	21	21	32
	6-9 times a year	23	27	27
	10-20 times a year	43	45	28
	Weekly	10	4	8
	Daily	2	2	4

Table 78

Information Recorded by Teachers for the Mathematics Tools and Strategies

Assessment Tool	Information Recorded	Year 5 %	Year 7 %	Year 9 %
Assessment Resource Banks	Nothing recorded	8	11	23
	Raw score/percent	38	53	50
	Grade	13	2	18
	Curriculum level	51	36	14
	Normed score	5	2	0
	Written comment	31	26	0
	Other	5	0	0
Beginning School Mathematics	Nothing recorded	20	0	0
	Raw score/percent	20	67	0
	Grade	20	0	0
	Curriculum level	20	33	50
	Normed score	0	0	0
	Written comment	40	67	0
	Other	0	0	0
Booker Profiles in Mathematics	Nothing recorded	0	33	0
	Raw score/percent	0	33	0
	Grade	0	0	0
	Curriculum level	0	33	50
	Normed score	0	0	0
	Written comment	0	67	0
	Other	0	0	0
Competition Tests	Nothing recorded	39	15	43
	Raw score/percent	33	56	30
	Grade	18	20	5
	Curriculum level	6	2	1
	Normed score	8	14	4
	Written comment	5	6	1
	Other	0	1	0
National Education Monitoring Project tasks	Nothing recorded	21	44	0
	Raw score/percent	16	24	29
	Grade	16	0	0
	Curriculum level	32	12	43
	Normed score	5	0	14
	Written comment	42	24	14
	Other	5	0	0
Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics	Nothing recorded	1	0	2
	Raw score/percent	77	75	69
	Grade	3	10	5
	Curriculum level	4	2	3
	Normed score	41	41	37
	Written comment	3	4	0
	Other	1	0	0
Topic and strand-based tests	Nothing recorded	0	0	0
	Raw score/percent	53	55	31
	Grade	13	18	8
	Curriculum level	39	51	38
	Normed score	2	2	0
	Written comment	0	0	0
	Other	0	0	0

Table 78 (contd.)

Assignments or homework	Nothing recorded	22	11	9
	Raw score/percent	23	30	42
	Grade	14	25	27
	Curriculum level	5	11	3
	Normed score	3	1	2
	Written comment	0	0	0
	Other	0	0	1
Checklist or rating scales	Nothing recorded	1	3	11
	Raw score/percent	34	39	28
	Grade	26	23	22
	Curriculum level	29	26	33
	Normed score	3	6	0
	Written comment	0	0	0
	Other	3	0	0
Conferencing or interviews	Nothing recorded	20	30	25
	Raw score/percent	4	8	4
	Grade	6	3	0
	Curriculum level	10	11	7
	Normed score	2	0	0
	Written comment	0	0	0
	Other	0	2	0
Exams	Nothing recorded	0	6	1
	Raw score/percent	75	56	83
	Grade	13	13	26
	Curriculum level	38	38	17
	Normed score	0	13	4
	Written comment	0	0	0
	Other	0	0	0
Exemplars	Nothing recorded	20	6	28
	Raw score/percent	27	31	17
	Grade	20	6	22
	Curriculum level	27	31	22
	Normed score	7	0	6
	Written comment	0	0	0
	Other	0	0	0
Observation	Nothing recorded	25	24	44
	Raw score/percent	3	7	5
	Grade	4	2	0
	Curriculum level	9	5	4
	Normed score	0	0	0
	Written comment	0	0	0
	Other	1	0	0
Peer assessment	Nothing recorded	34	29	38
	Raw score/percent	26	18	13
	Grade	5	13	25
	Curriculum level	6	5	19
	Normed score	0	2	0
	Written comment	0	0	0
	Other	0	0	0

Table 78 (contd.)

Portfolios or work samples	Nothing recorded	2	13	19
	Raw score/percent	37	23	25
	Grade	11	14	31
	Curriculum level	34	38	14
	Normed score	3	3	3
	Written comment	0	0	0
	Other	1	0	3
School developed tests	Nothing recorded	0	0	0
	Raw score/percent	67	66	77
	Grade	21	26	26
	Curriculum level	48	39	33
	Normed score	5	4	3
	Written comment	0	0	0
	Other	0	0	1
Student-self assessment	Nothing recorded	14	21	52
	Raw score/percent	19	15	21
	Grade	15	13	7
	Curriculum level	4	2	0
	Normed score	1	1	0
	Written comment	0	0	0
	Other	0	1	0
Teacher written tests	Nothing recorded	0	2	7
	Raw score/percent	60	67	74
	Grade	22	25	14
	Curriculum level	33	34	7
	Normed score	6	4	4
	Written comment	0	0	0
	Other	1	1	0

Table 79

Teachers' Use of the Information from the Mathematics Tools and Strategies

Assessment Tool	To Provide Information for	Year 5 %	Year 7 %	Year 9 %
Assessment Resource Banks	Teaching and learning	95	91	91
	Monitoring progress	79	74	68
	Students	56	57	55
	Parents or caregivers	46	51	41
	Next years teacher	44	38	36
	School management	56	55	32
	External agencies	36	32	27
Beginning School Mathematics	Teaching and learning	100	100	50
	Monitoring progress	60	67	50
	Students	40	67	50
	Parents or caregivers	40	67	50
	Next years teacher	40	33	50
	School management	40	67	50
	External agencies	40	33	50
Booker Profiles in Mathematics	Teaching and learning	0	100	50
	Monitoring progress	0	67	50
	Students	0	33	50
	Parents or caregivers	0	33	50
	Next years teacher	0	67	50
	School management	0	67	50
	External agencies	0	67	50
Competition Tests	Teaching and learning	59	72	34
	Monitoring progress	45	62	26
	Students	71	84	71
	Parents or caregivers	86	81	52
	Next years teacher	39	46	17
	School management	53	49	19
	External agencies	41	37	13
National Education Monitoring Project tasks	Teaching and learning	89	68	86
	Monitoring progress	58	52	71
	Students	47	48	43
	Parents or caregivers	32	40	29
	Next years teacher	32	36	14
	School management	47	48	14
	External agencies	42	56	14
Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics	Teaching and learning	78	78	76
	Monitoring progress	75	74	61
	Students	38	46	19
	Parents or caregivers	71	76	29
	Next years teacher	70	69	53
	School management	75	81	58
	External agencies	55	53	29
Topic and strand-based tests	Teaching and learning	89	96	62
	Monitoring progress	86	86	69
	Students	75	80	54
	Parents or caregivers	63	67	46
	Next years teacher	55	55	46
	School management	50	59	46
	External agencies	44	41	31

Table 79 (contd.)

Assignments or homework	Teaching and learning	84	93	87
	Monitoring progress	72	74	71
	Students	88	87	82
	Parents or caregivers	84	80	76
	Next years teacher	35	35	16
	School management	36	31	18
	External agencies	29	28	12
Checklist or rating scales	Teaching and learning	89	94	78
	Monitoring progress	91	88	72
	Students	67	70	72
	Parents or caregivers	63	54	61
	Next years teacher	53	51	50
	School management	44	43	39
	External agencies	39	36	33
Conferencing or interviews	Teaching and learning	93	86	79
	Monitoring progress	82	73	61
	Students	89	86	79
	Parents or caregivers	57	65	71
	Next years teacher	37	41	29
	School management	31	34	21
	External agencies	27	33	21
Exams	Teaching and learning	63	88	66
	Monitoring progress	88	75	85
	Students	88	56	87
	Parents or caregivers	75	63	90
	Next years teacher	88	50	66
	School management	75	50	56
	External agencies	38	38	26
Exemplars	Teaching and learning	80	88	78
	Monitoring progress	73	69	67
	Students	60	69	67
	Parents or caregivers	47	56	61
	Next years teacher	53	69	28
	School management	53	75	17
	External agencies	33	63	17
Observation	Teaching and learning	94	94	81
	Monitoring progress	89	87	74
	Students	70	65	53
	Parents or caregivers	56	59	33
	Next years teacher	44	40	19
	School management	33	35	14
	External agencies	27	27	12
Peer assessment	Teaching and learning	79	71	63
	Monitoring progress	71	56	44
	Students	89	89	81
	Parents or caregivers	39	40	25
	Next years teacher	32	32	19
	School management	32	27	25
	External agencies	29	29	19

Table 79 (contd.)

Portfolios or work samples	Teaching and learning	71	76	72
	Monitoring progress	76	77	69
	Students	84	79	75
	Parents or caregivers	87	88	67
	Next years teacher	58	65	47
	School management	52	56	25
	External agencies	43	51	22
School developed tests	Teaching and learning	75	91	83
	Monitoring progress	84	84	90
	Students	64	78	89
	Parents or caregivers	64	70	84
	Next years teacher	64	61	57
	School management	68	61	43
	External agencies	51	45	28
Student-self assessment	Teaching and learning	79	76	62
	Monitoring progress	73	72	55
	Students	94	88	86
	Parents or caregivers	59	57	28
	Next years teacher	33	35	28
	School management	35	31	21
	External agencies	33	33	21
Teacher written tests	Teaching and learning	94	90	92
	Monitoring progress	97	87	84
	Students	85	81	89
	Parents or caregivers	63	61	47
	Next years teacher	41	45	24
	School management	37	40	20
	External agencies	33	32	14

Table 80

Teachers' Rating of the Usefulness of the Mathematics Tools and Strategies for Providing Information for 'Teaching and Learning'

Assessment Tool	Rating of Usefulness	Year 5 %	Year 7 %	Year 9 %
Assessment Resource Banks	Of little or no use	0	0	0
	of some use	22	14	25
	useful	51	40	30
	very useful	27	47	45
Beginning School Mathematics	Of little or no use	0	0	0
	of some use	20	33	0
	useful	20	67	0
	very useful	60	0	100
Booker Profiles in Mathematics	Of little or no use	0	33	0
	of some use	0	33	100
	useful	0	33	0
	very useful	0	0	0
Competition Tests	Of little or no use	21	19	19
	of some use	49	24	46
	useful	23	41	23
	very useful	8	12	12
National Education Monitoring Project tasks	Of little or no use	6	6	0
	of some use	12	35	17
	useful	53	29	50
	very useful	29	24	33
Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics	Of little or no use	5	9	6
	of some use	30	30	34
	useful	36	39	40
	very useful	27	20	19
Topic and strand-based tests	Of little or no use	0	0	13
	of some use	4	15	25
	useful	37	45	50
	very useful	60	40	13
Assignments or homework	Of little or no use	4	3	0
	of some use	21	21	7
	useful	46	43	42
	very useful	30	31	49
Checklists or rating scales	Of little or no use	2	2	0
	of some use	16	20	14
	useful	52	46	50
	very useful	31	31	36
Conferencing or interviews	Of little or no use	0	1	9
	of some use	8	9	23
	useful	28	28	32
	very useful	63	60	32
Exams	Of little or no use	0	7	2
	of some use	0	43	11
	useful	40	21	44
	very useful	60	29	43
Exemplars	Of little or no use	0	14	0
	of some use	25	21	14
	useful	33	29	57
	very useful	42	36	29

Table 80 (contd.)

Observation	Of little or no use	0	0	0
	of some use	3	4	13
	useful	25	24	26
	very useful	70	70	59
Peer assessment	Of little or no use	2	0	0
	of some use	33	50	50
	useful	47	27	10
	very useful	18	23	40
Portfolios or work samples	Of little or no use	5	11	0
	of some use	22	29	23
	useful	34	29	38
	very useful	40	31	38
School developed tests	Of little or no use	0	1	0
	of some use	13	15	10
	useful	36	40	43
	very useful	51	44	46
Student-self assessment	Of little or no use	2	2	0
	of some use	30	23	39
	useful	32	43	39
	very useful	37	31	22
Teacher written tests	Of little or no use	0	2	0
	of some use	5	3	9
	useful	22	30	38
	very useful	73	65	53

Table 81

Teachers' Rating of the Usefulness of the Mathematics Tools and Strategies for Providing Information for 'Monitoring Progress'

Assessment Tool	**Rating of Usefulness**	**Year 5** **%**	**Year 7** **%**	**Year 9** **%**
Assessment Resource Banks	Of little or no use	6	0	7
	of some use	16	23	20
	useful	45	43	47
	very useful	29	34	27
Beginning School Mathematics	Of little or no use	0	0	0
	of some use	67	0	0
	useful	0	100	0
	very useful	33	0	100
Booker Profiles in Mathematics	Of little or no use	0	0	0
	of some use	0	0	100
	useful	0	100	0
	very useful	0	0	0
Competition Tests	Of little or no use	30	24	30
	of some use	47	36	40
	useful	17	30	20
	very useful	7	8	10
National Education Monitoring Project tasks	Of little or no use	9	15	0
	of some use	18	38	20
	useful	36	31	40
	very useful	36	8	40
Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics	Of little or no use	3	9	8
	of some use	27	28	37
	useful	51	47	42
	very useful	17	14	13
Topic and strand-based tests	Of little or no use	0	2	11
	of some use	4	12	33
	useful	36	40	33
	very useful	60	45	22
Assignments or homework	Of little or no use	11	12	4
	of some use	24	21	12
	useful	34	44	33
	very useful	30	23	48
Checklists or rating scales	Of little or no use	0	3	8
	of some use	17	11	8
	useful	42	41	54
	very useful	41	43	31
Conferencing or interviews	Of little or no use	1	0	6
	of some use	8	6	12
	useful	25	29	47
	very useful	65	62	35
Exams	Of little or no use	0	0	1
	of some use	0	0	7
	useful	29	50	46
	very useful	71	50	46
Exemplars	Of little or no use	0	18	8
	of some use	9	45	25
	useful	73	0	50
	very useful	18	36	17

Table 81 (contd.)

Observation	Of little or no use	0	0	2
	of some use	3	8	10
	useful	22	29	45
	very useful	74	61	40
Peer assessment	Of little or no use	2	9	0
	of some use	41	46	43
	useful	43	20	14
	very useful	14	23	43
Portfolios or work samples	Of little or no use	1	5	0
	of some use	14	21	24
	useful	46	36	40
	very useful	39	36	36
School developed tests	Of little or no use	0	0	0
	of some use	11	6	4
	useful	34	30	41
	very useful	54	64	54
Student-self assessment	Of little or no use	0	8	6
	of some use	33	37	38
	useful	36	32	25
	very useful	31	21	31
Teacher written tests	Of little or no use	0	1	0
	of some use	4	7	10
	useful	30	28	40
	very useful	65	61	48

Table 82

Teachers' Rating of the Usefulness of the Mathematics Tools and Strategies for Providing Information for 'Students'

Assessment Tool	Rating of Usefulness	Year 5 %	Year 7 %	Year 9 %
Assessment Resource Banks	Of little or no use	9	15	8
	of some use	23	19	25
	useful	55	48	25
	very useful	14	19	42
Beginning School Mathematics	Of little or no use	50	50	0
	of some use	50	50	0
	useful	0	0	0
	very useful	0	0	100
Booker Profiles in Mathematics	Of little or no use	0	0	0
	of some use	0	0	100
	useful	0	100	0
	very useful	0	0	0
Competition Tests	Of little or no use	6	9	9
	of some use	40	37	40
	useful	40	37	33
	very useful	11	16	16
National Education Monitoring Project tasks	Of little or no use	0	25	0
	of some use	22	33	0
	useful	67	33	33
	very useful	11	8	67
Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics	Of little or no use	43	32	42
	of some use	26	32	17
	useful	23	26	25
	very useful	6	9	8
Topic and strand-based tests	Of little or no use	2	3	14
	of some use	19	21	43
	useful	38	56	43
	very useful	42	21	0
Assignments or homework	Of little or no use	2	3	0
	of some use	19	13	15
	useful	53	59	41
	very useful	25	23	41
Checklists or rating scales	Of little or no use	17	17	0
	of some use	17	27	8
	useful	47	40	62
	very useful	20	17	23
Conferencing or interviews	Of little or no use	3	0	5
	of some use	10	10	9
	useful	25	33	45
	very useful	62	55	32
Exams	Of little or no use	0	0	3
	of some use	29	11	14
	useful	43	78	38
	very useful	29	11	45
Exemplars	Of little or no use	22	18	0
	of some use	22	9	8
	useful	22	45	42
	very useful	33	27	33

Table 82 (contd.)

Observation	Of little or no use	4	6	7
	of some use	11	13	17
	useful	33	33	27
	very useful	51	46	47
Peer assessment	Of little or no use	0	0	8
	of some use	20	24	38
	useful	47	35	31
	very useful	33	40	23
Portfolios or work samples	Of little or no use	3	9	0
	of some use	19	18	33
	useful	35	34	30
	very useful	43	38	33
School developed tests	Of little or no use	9	2	0
	of some use	17	18	9
	useful	39	42	38
	very useful	35	39	51
Student-self assessment	Of little or no use	0	0	4
	of some use	15	17	36
	useful	35	34	20
	very useful	51	47	36
Teacher written tests	Of little or no use	1	1	0
	of some use	12	4	9
	useful	43	48	48
	very useful	42	45	39

Table 83

Teachers' Rating of the Usefulness of the Mathematics Tools and Strategies for Providing Information for 'Parents or Caregivers'

Assessment Tool	Rating of Usefulness	Year 5 %	Year 7 %	Year 9 %
Assessment Resource Banks	Of little or no use	11	13	22
	of some use	33	33	33
	useful	44	33	22
	very useful	11	21	22
Beginning School Mathematics	Of little or no use	50	50	0
	of some use	50	0	0
	useful	0	50	100
	very useful	0	0	0
Booker Profiles in Mathematics	Of little or no use	0	0	0
	of some use	0	0	100
	useful	0	100	0
	very useful	0	0	0
Competition Tests	Of little or no use	4	6	13
	of some use	39	38	35
	useful	44	44	35
	very useful	12	11	18
National Education Monitoring Project tasks	Of little or no use	17	30	0
	of some use	17	50	50
	useful	67	20	50
	very useful	0	0	0
Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics	Of little or no use	11	14	11
	of some use	38	36	39
	useful	37	35	33
	very useful	12	13	11
Topic and strand-based tests	Of little or no use	10	6	17
	of some use	10	18	33
	useful	45	61	33
	very useful	35	15	17
Assignments or homework	Of little or no use	0	2	1
	of some use	23	20	22
	useful	52	50	36
	very useful	25	25	36
Checklists or rating scales	Of little or no use	14	19	0
	of some use	25	35	9
	useful	34	32	64
	very useful	27	14	18
Conferencing or interviews	Of little or no use	12	14	5
	of some use	18	27	15
	useful	31	29	35
	very useful	39	31	40
Exams	Of little or no use	0	0	3
	of some use	50	20	5
	useful	17	70	36
	very useful	33	10	55
Exemplars	Of little or no use	29	11	27
	of some use	14	22	0
	useful	14	44	45
	very useful	43	22	9

Table 83 (contd.)

Observation	Of little or no use	14	17	5
	of some use	15	22	26
	useful	34	32	37
	very useful	37	27	26
Peer assessment	Of little or no use	25	52	0
	of some use	29	28	50
	useful	38	16	25
	very useful	8	4	25
Portfolios or work samples	Of little or no use	3	1	8
	of some use	11	14	21
	useful	31	29	42
	very useful	55	54	25
School developed tests	Of little or no use	6	7	0
	of some use	23	18	11
	useful	43	36	41
	very useful	28	39	45
Student-self assessment	Of little or no use	4	20	13
	of some use	30	22	38
	useful	34	35	25
	very useful	32	22	13
Teacher written tests	Of little or no use	0	6	6
	of some use	22	21	9
	useful	48	39	46
	very useful	28	32	37

Table 84

Teachers' Rating of the Usefulness of the Mathematics Tools and Strategies for Providing Information for 'Next Year's Teacher'

Assessment Tool	Rating of Usefulness	Year 5 %	Year 7 %	Year 9 %
Assessment Resource Banks	Of little or no use	6	6	13
	of some use	35	44	25
	useful	35	44	13
	very useful	24	6	38
Beginning School Mathematics	Of little or no use	50	100	0
	of some use	50	0	0
	useful	0	0	0
	very useful	0	0	100
Booker Profiles in Mathematics	Of little or no use	0	0	0
	of some use	0	0	100
	useful	0	100	0
	very useful	0	0	0
Competition Tests	Of little or no use	42	38	23
	of some use	23	27	23
	useful	23	27	31
	very useful	12	5	23
National Education Monitoring Project tasks	Of little or no use	17	44	0
	of some use	33	56	0
	useful	50	0	100
	very useful	0	0	0
Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics	Of little or no use	3	6	3
	of some use	40	32	39
	useful	31	48	42
	very useful	26	13	12
Topic and strand-based tests	Of little or no use	11	15	33
	of some use	11	30	0
	useful	49	30	50
	very useful	29	26	17
Assignments or homework	Of little or no use	62	46	33
	of some use	26	32	7
	useful	12	14	33
	very useful	0	5	27
Checklists or rating scales	Of little or no use	16	17	11
	of some use	30	20	22
	useful	38	46	56
	very useful	16	17	11
Conferencing or interviews	Of little or no use	40	41	38
	of some use	36	27	13
	useful	18	19	13
	very useful	6	14	38
Exams	Of little or no use	0	0	2
	of some use	14	25	28
	useful	57	50	24
	very useful	29	25	46
Exemplars	Of little or no use	25	18	40
	of some use	38	37	0
	useful	38	27	40
	very useful	0	18	20

Table 84 (contd.)

Observation	Of little or no use	22	45	0
	of some use	26	17	18
	useful	30	21	18
	very useful	22	14	55
Peer assessment	Of little or no use	45	65	33
	of some use	30	30	0
	useful	25	5	33
	very useful	0	0	33
Portfolios or work samples	Of little or no use	8	16	6
	of some use	34	16	6
	useful	28	30	35
	very useful	30	38	53
School developed tests	Of little or no use	2	6	2
	of some use	28	14	26
	useful	43	43	38
	very useful	28	37	32
Student-self assessment	Of little or no use	27	50	38
	of some use	38	33	13
	useful	15	13	13
	very useful	19	3	38
Teacher written tests	Of little or no use	19	31	28
	of some use	28	20	11
	useful	31	20	28
	very useful	22	27	33

Table 85

Teachers' Rating of the Usefulness of the Mathematics Tools and Strategies for Providing Information for 'School Management'

Assessment Tool	Frequency of Use	Year 5 %	Year 7 %	Year 9 %
Assessment Resource Banks	Of little or no use	5	12	14
	of some use	41	27	29
	useful	32	54	29
	very useful	23	8	14
Beginning School Mathematics	Of little or no use	0	50	0
	of some use	50	0	0
	useful	0	0	0
	very useful	50	50	100
Booker Profiles in Mathematics	Of little or no use	0	0	0
	of some use	0	50	100
	useful	0	50	0
	very useful	0	0	0
Competition Tests	Of little or no use	23	15	20
	of some use	46	38	40
	useful	26	38	27
	very useful	6	8	13
National Education Monitoring Project tasks	Of little or no use	0	0	0
	of some use	22	42	0
	useful	67	50	100
	very useful	11	8	0
Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics	Of little or no use	4	7	6
	of some use	26	23	31
	useful	44	51	47
	very useful	24	19	11
Topic and strand-based tests	Of little or no use	16	21	17
	of some use	19	17	17
	useful	41	38	50
	very useful	25	24	17
Assignments or homework	Of little or no use	57	52	24
	of some use	23	36	29
	useful	20	9	41
	very useful	0	3	0
Checklists or rating scales	Of little or no use	10	20	14
	of some use	45	33	57
	useful	29	30	29
	very useful	13	17	0
Conferencing or interviews	Of little or no use	39	42	50
	of some use	25	42	0
	useful	21	10	33
	very useful	14	6	17
Exams	Of little or no use	0	0	2
	of some use	33	25	11
	useful	67	50	37
	very useful	0	25	48
Exemplars	Of little or no use	13	25	67
	of some use	25	17	0
	useful	38	33	33
	very useful	25	25	0

Table 85 (contd.)

Observation	Of little or no use	34	43	13
	of some use	29	30	13
	useful	23	14	13
	very useful	11	11	50
Peer assessment	Of little or no use	40	71	25
	of some use	35	24	25
	useful	25	6	25
	very useful	0	0	25
Portfolios or work samples	Of little or no use	8	17	22
	of some use	31	21	22
	useful	35	33	33
	very useful	25	29	22
School developed tests	Of little or no use	2	6	5
	of some use	22	16	16
	useful	48	45	43
	very useful	28	33	35
Student-self assessment	Of little or no use	29	59	33
	of some use	32	33	17
	useful	25	7	33
	very useful	14	0	17
Teacher written tests	Of little or no use	13	28	33
	of some use	41	13	13
	useful	34	40	27
	very useful	13	20	20

Table 86

Teachers' Rating of the Usefulness of the Mathematics Tools and Strategies for Providing Information for 'External Agencies'

Assessment Tool	Frequency of Use	Year 5 %	Year 7 %	Year 9 %
Assessment Resource Banks	Of little or no use	8	7	17
	of some use	31	27	33
	useful	46	47	17
	very useful	15	20	33
Beginning School Mathematics	Of little or no use	0	100	0
	of some use	50	0	0
	useful	0	0	0
	very useful	50	0	100
Booker Profiles in Mathematics	Of little or no use	0	0	0
	of some use	0	50	0
	useful	0	50	100
	very useful	0	0	0
Competition Tests	Of little or no use	23	33	40
	of some use	42	37	30
	useful	15	17	10
	very useful	19	10	20
National Education Monitoring Project tasks	Of little or no use	0	8	0
	of some use	75	23	0
	useful	13	69	100
	very useful	13	0	0
Progressive Achievement Test: Mathematics	Of little or no use	8	11	6
	of some use	26	24	33
	useful	40	45	44
	very useful	22	18	11
Topic and strand-based tests	Of little or no use	15	25	50
	of some use	15	20	0
	useful	37	45	50
	very useful	33	10	0
Assignments or homework	Of little or no use	63	55	73
	of some use	19	28	9
	useful	11	14	18
	very useful	4	0	0
Checklists or rating scales	Of little or no use	11	16	17
	of some use	41	28	50
	useful	30	32	33
	very useful	11	20	0
Conferencing or interviews	Of little or no use	50	53	83
	of some use	29	23	0
	useful	17	13	17
	very useful	4	7	0
Exams	Of little or no use	0	17	19
	of some use	67	33	19
	useful	33	50	19
	very useful	0	0	43
Exemplars	Of little or no use	20	30	33
	of some use	20	10	33
	useful	0	40	33
	very useful	60	20	0

Table 86 (contd.)

Observation	Of little or no use	33	62	29
	of some use	33	14	14
	useful	15	17	29
	very useful	15	7	29
Peer assessment	Of little or no use	28	56	33
	of some use	50	17	0
	useful	22	22	33
	very useful	0	6	33
Portfolios or work samples	Of little or no use	10	16	38
	of some use	23	27	0
	useful	40	32	38
	very useful	28	23	25
School developed tests	Of little or no use	4	13	14
	of some use	36	23	0
	useful	29	16	29
	very useful	29	16	14
Student-self assessment	Of little or no use			
	of some use			
	useful			
	very useful			
Teacher written tests	Of little or no use	16	33	40
	of some use	25	15	0
	useful	22	10	7
	very useful	13	8	20

APPENDIX C

Letter sent to schools with the questionnaire requesting participation

Dear Colleague

STUDY ON THE CURRENT CLASSROOM ASSESSMENT PRACTICES
IN ENGLISH AND MATHEMATICS

The New Zealand Council for Educational Research (NZCER) are currently undertaking research on the current classroom assessment practices in English and mathematics, at years 5, 7, and 9. As there have been a number of recent initiatives in assessment, this research will enable base-line data to be collected which can then be used to track changes in classroom practices. By getting a better understanding of what is actually happening in our classrooms, teachers' concerns and priorities will be better identified for schools, teachers, and policy makers.

Your school has been randomly selected to participate in this study. We trust that the teachers selected will be interested in completing the questionnaire so that accurate and useful information on what is happening in our classrooms can be gained.

We ask that **1/2/4 teachers of year 5/7/9 students** complete the enclosed questionnaires. Instructions for how the teachers should be selected are attached to this letter.

Also enclosed are envelopes for each teacher to put their completed questionnaire in – this will ensure their responses remain confidential. We ask that one person collect these envelopes from the teachers and return them to NZCER in the freepost envelope provided. It would be greatly appreciated if they could be returned by **2 November**. If we have not had a reply by this date, we will contact you to ensure the materials arrived, to see if you need replacement questionnaires, or to confirm that your school does not wish to participate in this study.

As a token of our gratitude for the time we acknowledge is involved in completing questionnaires, we have enclosed a complimentary copy of the latest edition of *Set*.

A summary report will be e-mailed to participating schools (or posted for those without e-mail contact) and will also be available on NZCER's website (http://www.nzcer.org.nz) in April 2002.

If you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact any member of the team, Karyn Dunn, Chris Marston, Ed Strafford, or Lia Mapa, on (04) 384 7939.

Many thanks for your help with this project.

Yours sincerely
Karyn Dunn
Project Leader

APPENDIX D

Instructions sent for the random selection of the teacher(s)

Instructions for selecting which teacher is to complete the questionnaire

- If there is only one teacher of Year 5/7/9 students at your school, please give the questionnaire to that person for completion.

- If there is more than one Year 5/7/9 teacher at your school,
  - Please list them in alphabetical order.
  - Use the table below to select which teacher from the list is to complete the questionnaire.

Number of Year 5/7/9 teachers on the list	*The teacher who is to complete the questionnaire*
2	1st on the list
3	2nd on the list
4	4th on the list
5	3rd on the list

Instructions for selecting two teachers to complete the questionnaire

- If there are only one or two teachers of Year 5/7/9 students at your school, please give a questionnaire to them all for completion.

- If there are more than two Year 5/7/9 teachers at your school:
  - Please list them in alphabetical order.
  - Use the table below to select which teachers from the list are to complete the questionnaire.

Number of Year 5/7/9 teachers on the list	*The teachers who are to complete the questionnaires*
3	1st and 3rd on the list
4	2nd and 4th on the list
5	1st and 4th on the list
6	1st and 3rd on the list
7	2nd and 6th on the list
8	3rd and 7th on the list
9	1st and 6th on the list
10	3rd and 9th on the list

Instructions for selecting four teachers to complete the questionnaire

- If there are four or less teachers of Year 5/7/9 students at your school, please give a questionnaire to them all for completion.

- If there are more than four Year 5/7/9 teachers at your school:
  - Please list them in alphabetical order.
  - Use the table below to select which teachers from the list are to complete the questionnaire.

Number of Year 5/7/9 teachers on the list	*The teachers who are to complete the questionnaires*
5	**1st, 3rd, 4th, and 5th on the list**
6	**2nd, 4th, 5th, and 6th on the list**
7	**2nd, 4th, 5th, and 7th on the list**
8	**1st, 3rd, 5th, and 7th on the list**
9	**2nd, 4th, 6th, and 9th on the list**
10	**1st, 5th, 7th, and 9th on the list**
11	**1st, 3rd, 5th, and 10th on the list**
12	**1st, 4th, 7th, and 10th on the list**
13	**1st, 4th, 8th, and 11th on the list**
14	**2nd, 5th, 8th, and 13th on the list**
15	**3rd, 9th, 12th, and 15th on the list**

APPENDIX E

Follow-up fax sent to schools

Dear Principal

Re: Current Classroom Assessment Practices in English and Mathematics Project

Earlier this term your school was randomly selected to participate in a study that NZCER are undertaking on the current classroom assessment practices in English and mathematics. This invitation to participate, along with the questionnaires, was sent to your school during the week of the 15th of October.

As we have not yet received a reply from your school, I am writing to once again ask if you could participate in this research study. It is vital that as many schools as possible complete the questionnaire so as to ensure the data collected fairly represents what is happening in New Zealand classrooms, at all levels, and in all school types. The aim for this project is to gain a better understanding of what is actually happening in our classrooms, so that teachers' concerns and priorities will be better identified for schools, teachers, and policy makers.

Although we are aware that completing questionnaires takes up teachers valuable time, we hope that the information this project could provide makes that time worthwhile.

We would appreciate if you could let us know as soon as possible if you are able to participate or not by completing the attached form so that we are able to select replacement schools if necessary.

Thank you for your time once again.

Yours sincerely
Karyn Dunn
Project Leader

To: Karyn Dunn, Project Leader

At: New Zealand Council for Educational Research

Fax: 04 385 8738

School Name: ______________________________

☐ Yes, we are willing to participate - we will post back our completed questionnaires.

☐ Yes, we are willing to participate - please re-send the questionnaires.

Please provide a contact name for the address label:

____

☐ Sorry we are unable to participate.

THANK YOU.

APPENDIX F

Questionnaire

NEW ZEALAND COUNCIL FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

CURRENT CLASSROOM ASSESSMENT PRACTICES IN ENGLISH – 2001

This questionnaire is part of a research project being undertaken by the New Zealand Council for Educational Research (NZCER) on current classroom assessment practices in mathematics and English. As there have been a number of recent initiatives in assessment, this research will enable base-line data to be collected which can then be used to track changes in classroom practices. By getting a better understanding of what is actually happening in our classrooms, teachers' concerns and priorities will be better identified for schools, teachers, and policy makers.

You have been randomly selected as part of a nationally representative sample of teachers to provide information about the **English assessments you use with your students in the year specified at the bottom of the page**. Your views and comments are very important to this project.

The information you offer is strictly confidential to members of the NZCER research team. The questionnaire is completed anonymously and individual schools will not be identifiable in any report from this study. A summary of the results will be e-mailed to participating schools and will be available on NZCER's website (http://www.nzcer.org.nz) from April 2002. Results will also be provided to the Ministry of Education.

Once you have completed the questionnaire please enclose it in the envelope provided and return it to the person at your school who is coordinating the return of the questionnaires to NZCER.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this research, please contact Karyn Dunn, Project Leader, on (04) 802 1467 or e-mail karyn.dunn@nzcer.org.nz

1. Please indicate your gender. a) ☐ **Female** b) ☐ **Male**

2. For how many years have you been teaching? ________

3. What is your position/level of responsibility in your school?

   a) ☐ **1st or 2nd year teacher**, e.g., Provisionally Registered, List A Teacher

   b) ☐ **Teacher**, e.g., Scale A Teacher, Assistant Teacher

   c) ☐ **Middle Management**, e.g., Management/PR Units, Head of Department, Curriculum or Syndicate Leader, Senior Teacher, Dean

   d) ☐ **Senior Management**, e.g., Teaching Principal, Teaching Deputy Principal, Teaching Assistant Principal

4. **a)** Do you have any curriculum responsibilities for English in your school? a) ☐ **Yes** b) ☐ **No**

   b) If yes, please state or describe your responsibilities.

   ____

This questionnaire is about how you assess your Year   students only.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THIS IS ABOUT HOW YOU ASSESS

INSTRUCTIONS

For each assessment that you use with this year group, please answer the corresponding row of questions.

EXAMPLE: *Assessment Resource Banks*

- *ARB resources were used about 5 times a year (Q5)*
- *Students' percentage correct was recorded (Q6)*
- *Used to inform teaching and learning and was very useful (Q7)*
- *Used for reporting to school management and was useful (Q7)*

5. Tick all the tools and strategies you use and write the code to show how frequently you administer them.

1 = once a year
2 = 2-5 times a year
3 = 6-9 times a year
4 = 10-20 times a year
5 = weekly
6 = daily

6. Write the code(s) for information you record.

0 = nothing recorded
1 = raw score/percent
2 = grade
3 = curriculum level
4 = normed score
5 = written comment
OR
other *(please specify)*

Assessment Resource Banks (ARBs) ⟶ ☑ 2 ⟶ 1

TYPE OF ENGLISH ASSESSMENT

EXTERNALLY DEVELOPED TOOLS				
Assessment Resource Banks (ARBs)	1)	☐	☐	☐
Burt Word Reading Test	2)	☐	☐	☐
Competition tests such as the Australian tests	3)	☐	☐	☐
Essential Skills Assessments: Information Skills (ESAs)	4)	☐	☐	☐
Graded Word Spelling Test (Vernon)	5)	☐	☐	☐
National Educational Monitoring Project tasks (NEMP)	6)	☐	☐	☐
Neale Analysis of Reading Ability	7)	☐	☐	☐
Peters Spelling Checklist	8)	☐	☐	☐
Progressive Achievement Tests: Listening Comprehension (PAT)	9)	☐	☐	☐
Progressive Achievement Tests: Tests of Reading (PAT)	10)	☐	☐	☐
Proof Reading Tests of Spelling (PRETOS)	11)	☐	☐	☐
Reading Prose Inventory	12)	☐	☐	☐
Schonell Spelling Test	13)	☐	☐	☐
Supplementary Tests of Achievement in Reading (STAR)	14)	☐	☐	☐
Tests of Reading Comprehension (TORCH)	15)	☐	☐	☐
TEACHER OR SCHOOL DEVELOPED STRATEGIES AND TOOLS				
Assignments or homework	16)	☐	☐	☐
Checklists or rating scales	17)	☐	☐	☐
Conferencing or interviews	18)	☐	☐	☐
Exams	19)	☐	☐	☐
Exemplars	20)	☐	☐	☐
Observation	21)	☐	☐	☐
Peer assessment	22)	☐	☐	☐
Portfolios or work samples	23)	☐	☐	☐
School, syndicate, or departmental developed tests	24)	☐	☐	☐
Student self assessment	25)	☐	☐	☐
Teacher written tests, used with your class only	26)	☐	☐	☐
OTHER TYPES *(Please specify)*				
________________		☐	☐	☐
________________		☐	☐	☐

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OUR YEAR STUDENTS ONLY.

7. Tick all the purpose(s) you use each assessment tool and strategy for with this year group. Then using the scale below, write the number that shows how useful you find the information to be for the assessments intended purpose.

1 = of little or no use
2 = of some use
3 = useful
4 = very useful

To provide information for:

teaching and learning	monitoring progress	students	parents or caregivers	next years teacher	school management	external agencies e.g., MoE, ERO etc
→ a) ☑ 4 →	b) ☐ ☐ →	c) ☐ ☐ →	d) ☐ ☐ →	e) ☐ ☐ →	f) ☑ 3 →	g) ☐ ☐

a) ☐ ☐	b) ☐ ☐	c) ☐ ☐	d) ☐ ☐	e) ☐ ☐	f) ☐ ☐	g) ☐ ☐
a) ☐ ☐	b) ☐ ☐	c) ☐ ☐	d) ☐ ☐	e) ☐ ☐	f) ☐ ☐	g) ☐ ☐
a) ☐ ☐	b) ☐ ☐	c) ☐ ☐	d) ☐ ☐	e) ☐ ☐	f) ☐ ☐	g) ☐ ☐
a) ☐ ☐	b) ☐ ☐	c) ☐ ☐	d) ☐ ☐	e) ☐ ☐	f) ☐ ☐	g) ☐ ☐

a) ☐ ☐	b) ☐ ☐	c) ☐ ☐	d) ☐ ☐	e) ☐ ☐	f) ☐ ☐	g) ☐ ☐
a) ☐ ☐	b) ☐ ☐	c) ☐ ☐	d) ☐ ☐	e) ☐ ☐	f) ☐ ☐	g) ☐ ☐
a) ☐ ☐	b) ☐ ☐	c) ☐ ☐	d) ☐ ☐	e) ☐ ☐	f) ☐ ☐	g) ☐ ☐
a) ☐ ☐	b) ☐ ☐	c) ☐ ☐	d) ☐ ☐	e) ☐ ☐	f) ☐ ☐	g) ☐ ☐

a) ☐ ☐	b) ☐ ☐	c) ☐ ☐	d) ☐ ☐	e) ☐ ☐	f) ☐ ☐	g) ☐ ☐
a) ☐ ☐	b) ☐ ☐	c) ☐ ☐	d) ☐ ☐	e) ☐ ☐	f) ☐ ☐	g) ☐ ☐
a) ☐ ☐	b) ☐ ☐	c) ☐ ☐	d) ☐ ☐	e) ☐ ☐	f) ☐ ☐	g) ☐ ☐
a) ☐ ☐	b) ☐ ☐	c) ☐ ☐	d) ☐ ☐	e) ☐ ☐	f) ☐ ☐	g) ☐ ☐

a) ☐ ☐	b) ☐ ☐	c) ☐ ☐	d) ☐ ☐	e) ☐ ☐	f) ☐ ☐	g) ☐ ☐
a) ☐ ☐	b) ☐ ☐	c) ☐ ☐	d) ☐ ☐	e) ☐ ☐	f) ☐ ☐	g) ☐ ☐
a) ☐ ☐	b) ☐ ☐	c) ☐ ☐	d) ☐ ☐	e) ☐ ☐	f) ☐ ☐	g) ☐ ☐

a) ☐ ☐	b) ☐ ☐	c) ☐ ☐	d) ☐ ☐	e) ☐ ☐	f) ☐ ☐	g) ☐ ☐
a) ☐ ☐	b) ☐ ☐	c) ☐ ☐	d) ☐ ☐	e) ☐ ☐	f) ☐ ☐	g) ☐ ☐
a) ☐ ☐	b) ☐ ☐	c) ☐ ☐	d) ☐ ☐	e) ☐ ☐	f) ☐ ☐	g) ☐ ☐
a) ☐ ☐	b) ☐ ☐	c) ☐ ☐	d) ☐ ☐	e) ☐ ☐	f) ☐ ☐	g) ☐ ☐

a) ☐ ☐	b) ☐ ☐	c) ☐ ☐	d) ☐ ☐	e) ☐ ☐	f) ☐ ☐	g) ☐ ☐
a) ☐ ☐	b) ☐ ☐	c) ☐ ☐	d) ☐ ☐	e) ☐ ☐	f) ☐ ☐	g) ☐ ☐
a) ☐ ☐	b) ☐ ☐	c) ☐ ☐	d) ☐ ☐	e) ☐ ☐	f) ☐ ☐	g) ☐ ☐
a) ☐ ☐	b) ☐ ☐	c) ☐ ☐	d) ☐ ☐	e) ☐ ☐	f) ☐ ☐	g) ☐ ☐

a) ☐ ☐	b) ☐ ☐	c) ☐ ☐	d) ☐ ☐	e) ☐ ☐	f) ☐ ☐	g) ☐ ☐
a) ☐ ☐	b) ☐ ☐	c) ☐ ☐	d) ☐ ☐	e) ☐ ☐	f) ☐ ☐	g) ☐ ☐
a) ☐ ☐	b) ☐ ☐	c) ☐ ☐	d) ☐ ☐	e) ☐ ☐	f) ☐ ☐	g) ☐ ☐

a) ☐ ☐	b) ☐ ☐	c) ☐ ☐	d) ☐ ☐	e) ☐ ☐	f) ☐ ☐	g) ☐ ☐
a) ☐ ☐	b) ☐ ☐	c) ☐ ☐	d) ☐ ☐	e) ☐ ☐	f) ☐ ☐	g) ☐ ☐
a) ☐ ☐	b) ☐ ☐	c) ☐ ☐	d) ☐ ☐	e) ☐ ☐	f) ☐ ☐	g) ☐ ☐

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

8. Please tick whether you receive any feedback about your students' assessment results from the following people. If *yes*, circle how useful you generally find this feedback to be.

Feedback received from:	Yes	No	*Usefulness of feedback* Of little or no use	Of some use	Useful	Very useful
a) Principal/DP/AP	a) ☐	b) ☐	1	2	3	4
b) Curriculum or Syndicate Leader/HoD	a) ☐	b) ☐	1	2	3	4
c) Other teacher(s)	a) ☐	b) ☐	1	2	3	4
d) BoT	a) ☐	b) ☐	1	2	3	4
e) Parent or caregiver	a) ☐	b) ☐	1	2	3	4
f) Student	a) ☐	b) ☐	1	2	3	4

9. a) Are there any English assessments that you are required to use, but if given the choice would not?

a) ☐ Yes b) ☐ No

b) If *yes*, please name the assessment(s) and tick or specify the source of the requirement.

Name of English assessment	a) On-going school policy	b) One-off management decision	c) Department or syndicate decision	d) BoT	e) MoE	f) Other source *(Please specify)*
____________	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	________
____________	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	________
____________	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	________

10. Circle the amount of assessment that you are doing in English with this year group compared with **three years** ago.

Not applicable	**A lot less**		**About the same**		**A lot more**
0	1	2	3	4	5

11. Circle how you feel about the overall amount of assessment you do in English.

Too little		**About right**		**Too much**
1	2	3	4	5

12. a) Is there a difference in the amount of assessment you do for the different strands of the NZ English curriculum?

a) ☐ Yes b) ☐ No *(If no, please go on to question 13)*

b) a) If *yes*, which function is the **most** frequently assessed? ***(please tick one only)***

a) ☐ **Listening** b) ☐ **Speaking** c) ☐ **Reading** d) ☐ **Writing** e) ☐ **Viewing** f) ☐ **Presenting**

b) Please tick the main reason(s) why.

a) ☐ **High priority for reporting** b) ☐ **Most important strand** c) ☐ **Confident with this strand**

d) ☐ **Lots of resources available** e) ☐ **Concepts easy to assess** f) ☐ **Has most content to assess**

g) **Other** *(please describe)* ______________________________

c) a) Which function is the **least** frequently assessed? ***(please tick one only)***

a) ☐ **Listening** b) ☐ **Speaking** c) ☐ **Reading** d) ☐ **Writing** e) ☐ **Viewing** f) ☐ **Presenting**

b) Please tick the main reason(s) why.

a) ☐ **Low priority for reporting** b) ☐ **Least important strand** c) ☐ **Not confident with this strand**

d) ☐ **Lack of resources available** e) ☐ **Concepts difficult to assess** f) ☐ **Has least content to assess**

g) **Other** *(please describe)* ______________________________

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

GENERAL CURRICULUM ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

If you are a teacher of Year 5 or 7 students, please answer questions 13 to 15.
If you are a teacher of Year 9 students, please go on to question 16.

13. Circle the amount of assessment that you are doing in each of the other curriculum areas with this year group compared with three years ago.

	Not applicable	A lot less		About the same		A lot more
a) Health and Physical Education	0	1	2	3	4	5
b) Mathematics	0	1	2	3	4	5
c) Science	0	1	2	3	4	5
d) Social Studies	0	1	2	3	4	5
e) The Arts	0	1	2	3	4	5
f) Technology	0	1	2	3	4	5

14. Circle how you feel about the overall amount of assessment you do in each of the other curriculum areas.

	Not applicable	Too little		About right		Too much
a) Health and Physical Education	0	1	2	3	4	5
b) Mathematics	0	1	2	3	4	5
c) Science	0	1	2	3	4	5
d) Social Studies	0	1	2	3	4	5
e) The Arts	0	1	2	3	4	5
f) Technology	0	1	2	3	4	5

If you do not take your class for all curriculum areas, please go on to question 16.

15. a) Is there a difference in the amount of assessment you do for the different curriculum areas?

a) ☐ Yes b) ☐ No *(If no, please go on to question 16)*

b) a) If *yes*, which curriculum area is the most frequently assessed? *(please tick one only)*

a) ☐ English b) ☐ Health and physical education c) ☐ Mathematics
d) ☐ Science e) ☐ Social Studies f) ☐ The arts g) ☐ Technology

b) Please tick the main reason(s) why.

a) ☐ High priority for reporting b) ☐ Most important area
c) ☐ Confident with this area d) ☐ Lots of resources available
e) ☐ Concepts easy to assess f) ☐ Has most content to assess

g) Other *(please describe)*____

c) a) Which curriculum area is the least frequently assessed? *(please tick one only)*

a) ☐ English b) ☐ Health and physical education c) ☐ Mathematics
d) ☐ Science e) ☐ Social Studies f) ☐ The arts g) ☐ Technology

b) Please tick the main reason(s) why.

a) ☐ Low priority for reporting b) ☐ Least important area
c) ☐ Not confident with this area d) ☐ Lack of resources available
e) ☐ Concepts difficult to assess f) ☐ Has least content to assess

g) Other *(please describe)* ____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

GENERAL ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS
All teachers please begin again at question 16.

16. a) Do you see any inconsistencies between your schools' assessment policy and your classroom assessment practices?

a) ☐ Yes b) ☐ No c) ☐ Not sure

b) If yes, please describe the inconsistencies you see.

____
____
____ b) 1 2 3
____ 4 5 6
7 8 9

17. a) Please tick all the sources you go to when you need to further understand an assessment issue.

a) ☐ **Principal/DP/AP**
b) ☐ **HoD/syndicate or curriculum leader**
c) ☐ **Other teachers/other senior staff**
d) ☐ **Advisors**
e) ☐ **ABeL facilitators**
f) ☐ **NZCER**
g) ☐ **ERO**
h) ☐ **Short courses/seminars/workshops**
i) ☐ **Books/other publications**
j) ☐ **Internet**
k) ☐ **Other** *(please specify)* ____________________

b) Please rank the two main sources you go to when you need to further understand an assessment issue.

1) Main source: ______________________________

2) Second main source: __________________________

18. a) Would you like to see any new assessment tools developed for New Zealand classrooms?

a) ☐ Yes b) ☐ No

b) If yes, please describe.

____
____
____ b) 1 2 3
____ 4 5 6
7 8 9

19. Please use this space to make any other comments about the assessment you do in your classroom that has not been covered by this questionnaire.

____
____
____
____ 19) 1 2 3
____ 4 5 6
____ 7 8 9

Thank you for completing this questionnaire.

School c[illegible]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

☒ This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☐ This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").

EFF-089 (1/2003)